

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. IX. *New Series.*

APRIL 1858.

PART LII.

ARE THE INTERESTS OF SCIENCE OPPOSED TO THE INTERESTS OF RELIGION?

WE shall hardly be thought guilty of an exaggeration, if we express our belief that many religious persons support the present movement in favour of science and general education with only half a heart. The change which a quarter of a century has wrought in public opinion is, indeed, sufficiently remarkable. It requires a distinct effort of the memory to enable us to recall the intensity of the prejudice with which many people, otherwise disagreeing, united in denouncing the progress of scientific studies and popular education as hostile to Christianity and hostile to national prosperity. Still, in some shape or other, the old ideas exist latent in quarters where few signs appear of any active opposition to the "spirit of the age." Many and many a solid and unprejudiced mind is but half convinced of the policy of feeding these new lights with the fuel of practical support. Many a man suspects that mischief will yet come of it; and suffers himself to be drawn into the stream because he cannot help it, rather than plunges boldly in, confident that the tide is running in the right direction.

We are not speaking merely of those who term themselves "the old school;" but of one entire class of thinkers, who are deserving of sincere respect, both for their personal claims, and for the special object which they have in view in refusing a cordial assent to the dominant opinions of the time. This object is the honour of God and the sacredness of the claims of Christianity. The allegiance of men to God as their God, and their adherence to the Christian religion as the revelation of His will, are, it is imagined, imperilled by an unhesitating search into the secrets of the material universe, by an un-

sparing criticism of the records of history, and by a scientific investigation into all the facts which human nature presents for our study.

Not that the school we refer to supposes that it is impossible to devote oneself to these studies in a religious spirit. The old absurdities of a past generation are gone by. People do not now believe that a man who studies Euclid can hardly believe in the Bible, or that a love for physical science is inconsistent with a love of Almighty God. The idea which we conceive to lie at the root of the suspiciousness of which we speak is of another kind. It is to the effect that the scientific study of nature is of a deceptive tendency; that it leads the mind to trust to unproved or half-proved speculations and theories, which may be hostile to the doctrines of Christianity, or to Christianity itself as a divine revelation. Those who are influenced by this idea are convinced that, though knowledge may be a good thing, simple-minded ignorance is certainly a better. And this, not because knowledge is not good in itself, or because ignorance is in itself to be desired; but because, from some mysterious reason, the study of nature practically tends to the disparagement of grace; and because the more a man knows of the realities of human life, whether past or present, the more likely he is to disbelieve in the Christian religion as the most momentous of realities, and as the divinely-appointed practical guide of his daily conduct.

In the investigation of a subject of such vast importance, exaggeration is a serious evil. We would not, therefore, overstate or understate the case by a single iota; and we believe that, strange as it may seem when thus nakedly stated, we have put it fairly. Many admirable persons cannot shake off the belief, that while the truths of religion and its practical deductions are certain, the truths of science and its deductions are uncertain; not, that is, less certain in degree, or less certain in individual instances—but altogether different in the way of logical proof, founded on different principles of reasoning, and tending to keep the mind away from God; while the object of religion is to bind it in absolute allegiance to God. It is their habit to dissociate the two species of knowledge, religious and secular, not as a matter of convenience or technical division, but as though some necessary and eternal distinction existed between them in the very nature of things, in their origin, and in the object for which they are created. Our knowledge of God and of His will, it is implied, rests on a foundation entirely distinct from any other species of knowledge. It is attained, not at this or that stage of its progress,

but in its very first elements, from a source which has little, if any thing, akin to the sources of secular knowledge, whether scientific or literary. Religious knowledge, it is considered, moreover, whether termed "faith" or not, is of so peculiarly delicate and sensitive a complexion that it will not stand the rough usage to which it must be subjected in the vigorous strife after natural knowledge. Whether it be from the inherent perversity of the human mind, or from the special character of religious belief, it is imagined that the two kinds of knowledge are subject to a perpetual tendency to come into conflict, and that, as a rule, the victory will usually be with nature over grace, unless the claims of the latter are protected by a guardianship to which the former is not entitled.

That a pious mind, if once influenced by these fundamental ideas as to the relative positions of nature and revelation, should be haunted with harassing suspicions when it yields to the educational movement of the age, is only what might be expected. Considering that the knowledge of God and our future destiny is immeasurably paramount to all other kinds of knowledge, we cannot be surprised if devout persons should sometimes throw cold water upon secular studies, to what appears to us an unreasonable extent, if they dread their influence on a man's religious creed and conduct. Accordingly their prepossessions demand a sincerely respectful treatment at the hands of those who dissent from them. They have a right not only to be heard, but to be answered. Their motives are so unimpeachable, that their views derive a kind of reflected value from the character of those who uphold them. Nothing can be more unjust and uncharitable than to denounce the adherents of this school as selfish ignorant retrogradists; as men who value ignorance for its own sake, who prefer superstition to enlightenment, and, under the guise of a love for Christianity, are mere seekers of their own personal ease or aggrandisement. No doubt, if we go through the world, we shall find plenty of this latter class to satisfy the most cynical of satirists. If you count them by actual numbers, humanity can supply a crowd of men and women, of all ages and countries, too lazy to think, too selfish to feel, too tyrannical to regard the bulk of mankind as fit for any thing but reproof and coercion. But making every allowance for the existence of these real obscurantists, it would be a serious mistake to thrust aside the scruples of the large number of persons who from the best motives suspect the influence of scientific and critical studies, as such. Those who, like ourselves, think such persons wrong, are bound to explain their reasons for so thinking; they are bound to explain their own

opinions on the subject ; and not only to explain them, but to prove them worthy of acceptance.

In attempting this explanation and proof, we need hardly premise that we are not at all touching on the purely theological subject of "divine faith." We are not about to discuss its metaphysical nature, its precise office with respect to the details of religious doctrine, nor to inquire by what tests its action on the mind may be distinguished from the emotions of self-originated fanaticism. The question between the advocates of scientific studies and those who fear their anti-religious influence does not necessarily involve any special opinion on these particular points. It is a question of the relation between the knowledge of the universe and its created inhabitants attained by observation and reasoning, and the knowledge of God and the destiny of man as announced by direct revelation. Whether or not the practical reception of the Christian religion is followed by the possession of a certain special spiritual gift, is quite another question. The fear entertained by the devout minds whom we are addressing rests on a supposed distinction between the very nature of scientific and historical studies, and the study of revealed religion as a subject for argument and logical proof, and has nothing to do with the subject of "divine faith."

The great truth, then, which we conceive to be overlooked by those who dread the influence of secular studies, is that which lies at the root of all religion, namely, that the God of grace is also the God of nature, and that the material universe, with all the facts connected with the history of mankind, are actually His instruments, by which He makes known to us Himself, and furnishes us with the first elements of religious belief. Paganism, in every form, is based upon a contrary supposition. Every variety of idolatry and polytheism starts with the assumption that the material universe is the work, or in some degree under the influence, of a power or powers distinct from the supreme God. From the simplest form of Oriental belief, which reduces the great invisible powers to two, the good and the evil principle, all through the more graceful shapes of Greek and Roman mythology, down to the lowest shape of African fetishism, one grand error pervades them all. Whether there is One Great Spirit, supreme, and alone good and just ; or whether the heavens swarm with a host of deities, coördinate in power, in rank, and in origin,—every where there is to be traced the belief that the physical world and the course of human events is a sort of instrument by which capricious or malevolent powers exert their sway. In the earliest days of Christianity the influence

of these systems produced the strange and monstrous heresies which find condemnation even as early as the time of the Apostles, and which supply so many fertile subjects to the primitive Church historian. Every where we see modifications of the same fundamental absurdity. Either the entire universe was imagined to be the work of some evil spirit, or portions of it to be in the possession of some wildly or ingeniously imagined minor deity, or the very bodies of men themselves were accounted the special servants of the evil principle by natural right as well as actual law and possession.

Christianity, on the contrary, starts with a directly contradictory belief. It is based on the preliminary conviction that there is one God, and none other; and that the visible universe and all its habitants, together with every invisible being, are simply the creations of His will and power. Every thing, moreover, as it comes forth from His hand is actually *good*, and in its order bears the impress of the nature of Him who created it. Whatever be the explanation of that tremendous mystery, the origin of evil, it *cannot* be explained on any possible hypothesis which makes the material universe the work of an evil power antagonistic to the one true and holy God.

Moreover, it is through this very material universe that the Creator actually announces His existence and His attributes to His intelligent creatures living on this globe. Theology, previously to and apart from revelation, is simply one of the natural sciences. The knowledge of the Creator of all things is its object. From the collection and examination of physical phenomena, and from the study of the natural facts of the human mind itself, by a direct reasoning process the mind learns that there is a God, that there is but one God; and that His attributes are of one description, and not of another. However vague and incorrect may be the popular ideas of natural theology in its most primitive forms, however deficient in its gathering together of phenomena, and however unable to guard itself from degenerating into polytheism,—this is the course which must be pursued by reason before she can accept any revelation. Before we can admit a revelation from God, we must learn that there is a God, and that His nature is such that His revelation is to be believed as a gracious truth, and not as a demoniacal mockery. And this is true, whatever be our views on the controversy respecting an inborn knowledge of, and belief in, a God. Whether or not by natural instinct every creature is confident that there is a God; whether also, or not, our innate idea of God

is merely a readiness to believe in one, correlative to the phenomena which the material world presents for study,—still the great fact remains, that the *practical* knowledge of God is a subject for natural science and for philosophic reasoning. The case is the same, again, to whatever period of the world's history we refer our inquiry. Whether it be the revelations of Christianity, or of Judaism, or patriarchal or literally primitive religion, still the preliminary condition to its acceptance is the same. A revelation *implies* the existence of a Supreme Being. That Being, in His existence and His eternal and principal attributes, must be known beforehand. To some extent He must be comprehended, both in His power and in His moral nature, before His creatures can understand or obey the revelation He makes to them.

And this preliminary work He has assigned to the universe of matter and of the human mind. It has not pleased Him to make Himself known to us by any means similar to those by which we know of the existence of the earth, of the stars, and of one another. However boundless may be His power, and however unlimited the instrumentality by which He might have communicated to our minds the perception of His existence and a knowledge of His attributes, as a matter of fact it has pleased Him to reveal Himself through that universe which is the subject of physical science, and through the phenomena of our own minds. He bids us infer His existence, and does not force it upon our consciousness in the same direct manner as the objects of sense force themselves upon our minds through the medium of our senses. In a word, previous to positive revelation through miracle, the material and mental universe is the voice of God to His creatures upon earth.

Again, apart from the scientific knowledge of the universe, or some portion of it, there can be no such a thing as a proved miracle. A miracle is an alteration in the laws of nature, which shows that a power is at work which is superior to those laws themselves. But how can we know what is and what is not an infraction of a natural law until we know what those laws are, at least to some extent? For all we can say in our ignorance, that may be a miracle which we take for the operation of a law, or that may be the operation of a law which we take for a miracle. Hence the innumerable superstitions of rude and barbarous ages. We may laugh at those superstitions; but it would be just as reasonable for a man six feet high to laugh at a child because it cannot look over a five-foot wall. A barbarous age sees

miracles every where, because its scientific knowledge is extremely limited; but its *principle* of interpretation may be as profoundly philosophical as that of the most acute and cautious of learned reasoners. The savage knows from observation that, unless obscured by clouds, the sun will shine from the morning till the evening. Of astronomy he knows nothing; and therefore when the sun is suddenly darkened by an eclipse, his soul is terror-stricken with dread of the supernatural powers whom he imagines to be breaking through the course of nature. But he is only wrong in his details, so to say. Philosophically he is right. From the facts of nature, and from the supposed infractions of her laws, he argues the present agency of an all-ruling deity.

That all sorts of monstrous theories respecting the material universe, and the manner in which its Great Creator is to be served, should have been invented by pagans and semi-paganised Christians, was but natural. A trembling and terrified worship of the powers of nature is the almost logical result of the polytheism of an ignorant world. To the idolatrous mind the bold investigations of philosophic science must often seem but an audacious prying into the secrets of superior beings. An awe-struck unreasoning dread or worship is the appropriate expression of the mind of polytheism in the presence of the majesty and glories of creation. Who could dare to handle and weigh the "bolts of Jove," when they were thought the direct instruments of awakened wrath? Who could inquire into the chemical action of miasma, when Apollo was imagined to be hurling his arrows on a guilty race? We might as reasonably presume to criticise the grammatical construction of the sentences of a real revelation from the true and only God.

Observe, on the other hand, the tone of the Scriptures with respect to the phenomena of nature. It has been remarked, that the splendours and the terrors of the universe were habitually viewed by the Jewish mind in a manner which is quite unlike that of the ordinary paganism of antiquity, and which bears a striking resemblance to that of modern and scientific times. The exquisite accuracy and appreciation with which, above all others, King David noted the wonders of nature has been observed by one of the greatest of modern philosophers, little as he was disposed to reverence any thing either Jewish or Christian. And this is just what we should anticipate in an age when, though scientific studies were in their infancy, yet the true nature of the universe, as the creation and the voice of one great and good Creator, was comprehended and rejoiced in. It is, indeed, a circumstance of

singular significance, that of the innumerable popular errors in physical science which were universal in ancient times, and which are to be found occasionally adopted in the writings of Christian authors almost up to the present day, there is literally but one which seems to be assumed as true in the pages of the Old Testament. We do not include the Mosaic account of the creation of the world, because there the question is one of interpretation. Be this, however, as it may, the habitual tendency of the Jewish mind to look upon nature with love, as contrasted with the tendency of the pagan mind to look upon it with fear, is a circumstance of no slight significance. The Jew beheld a God of goodness in all His works. The pagan mind found its type in its hero startled by the blood that flowed from the twigs he plucked from the shrubs in the enchanted bower.

May we not, then,—to return to our main subject,—fairly argue, that to view with suspicion the progress of science and the study of the history of man, after we have learnt that there is a God, and that He has given us a revelation, is a most inconsistent and illogical mistake? Is it not, in truth, something suicidal, and tending directly to throw doubts upon Christianity and upon natural religion itself? If one of the purposes for which God has surrounded us with these myriad and manifold manifestations of His power is to lead us to know Himself, how can it be imagined that when we have thus learnt to know Him, the continuance of the study of His works should suddenly become pernicious? If by the instrumentality of the natural world we have gained an insight into the supernatural, how can it be that henceforth the natural should tend to obscure the supernatural world to which it has introduced us? Has nature become antagonistic to God the moment it has accomplished one particular work which He has assigned to it? Does God cease to be the author of nature because we have ascertained that He is also the author of grace? Is the visible creation one whit less good in its order than the invisible? Are not the flowers of the field, the depths of the mines, the powers of electricity and of steam, as really the works of God as is an archangel or the soul of a man? What should we know of the invisible world, were it not that the visible world has itself been the instrument for teaching us more than its own nature and laws? Surely the word “supernatural” is not the same as “anti-natural.” We cannot make “nature” and “grace” enemies in this way. God is not honoured by a depreciation of any of His works. Elementary knowledge does not become worthless when it is developed into the knowledge of matured life.

So too in the prosecution of literary studies, historical, poetic, metaphysical, or critical. What should we know of the Gospel, were it not for these very studies? How have we who write, and they who read, become acquainted with the fact that eighteen centuries ago the Almighty God gave a revelation to mankind, that such and such are the records of such revelation, and such and such its doctrines? We do not know these things by intuition, by guessing, by chance; we know them by historical studies, by verbal criticisms, by metaphysical inquiries, by scientific observation of the facts of human nature as they are presented to us in our own characters and in the lives of our friends and acquaintances. A Catholic has divine faith in the doctrines which the Church puts before him as portions of the revelation of Jesus Christ. But why does he go to the Church to teach him these things? Because he believes that it is an historical external fact that the Founder of Christianity directed mankind to go to a living Church for an exposition of the doctrines He revealed. And how does he know any thing about Christianity itself, as a thing to be attended to, examined, and finally accepted as from God? By historical criticism only, in some shape or other. He does not know it by inspiration; his own feelings and likings are no test of its truth. He may believe in Christianity on the most full and profound investigation of its claims, or he may believe in it on the grounds on which the poor and ignorant believe in it; but every trustworthy argument which leads him up to the portals of the Church is an historical and critical argument, a process of honest reasoning founded on the elementary facts of human life and human society. It is the result of that very employment of the natural faculties, exercised on the life of man past and present, which has produced the gigantic mass of historical, critical, metaphysical, and poetical literature of the present and all past ages.

Disparage, then, the study of mathematical and physical science, or of general literature in any of its branches, and see what we are doing. We are destroying the very foundations of our religious belief itself. We are mounting into the branches of a tree only to sever the trunk from which they grow. Destroy the deductions of natural science, and where are your miracles? Destroy the deductions of history and criticism, and where is the narrative of the foundation of Christianity? To imagine that the physical universe is not to be studied zealously except for the sake of proving miracles, or that historical investigation is to be discouraged when not specially designed to prove the truth of Christianity,

argues a total misconception of the nature of the proofs of natural theology and revelation. If you set an arbitrary limit to your studies, whether of science or of human nature, you never can trust your results. You may have passed by the most important facts which bear upon your inquiries; your deductions will be based upon mere guess-work.

Nor can we overlook the immense mischief that is done to others by the betraying of any thing like a dread of scientific and critical studies. Whatever a man's ideas with respect to Christianity, he is always sharp enough to argue that *the* truth, whatever it is, does not ask for concealment, for false reasoning, or for a blinking of realities. The scientific world knows that the material universe and the events of human history are a great fact. To tell its disciples that the *bond-fide* study of its laws and events naturally tends to weaken the proofs of Christianity, and to diminish a man's interest in religion, is equivalent in their minds to an admission that the proof of Christianity is hollow after all, and that religion is more or less a sham. A scientific or literary man may have very little practical devotion, and yet he may have a very firm grasp of the truth that the natural works of God cannot be antagonistic to His supernatural works. He may be ill-informed as to the historical proofs of Christianity, or entertain a strong dislike to certain details of religious belief and practice, and yet be well convinced that the conclusions of an argument cannot be contrary to its premises, and that you cannot first employ reason to prove Christianity, and then turn round and destroy reason in order to uphold Christianity. It requires a simple exercise of common sense to admit the Christian principle that the doctrines of revelation may be *above* reason; but an equally simple exertion of sense points out that to be "*above* reason" is a very different thing from being "*contrary* to reason."

And it is because scientific and learned men sometimes imagine that the adherents of Christianity wish to destroy the claims of reason *rightly* exercised, that the dread of science and criticism, to which we allude, does such serious mischief. They suspect us of an *arrière pensée*. They think that we are conscious of flaws in our argument which will not bear the full light of truth. They are persuaded that we are not quite convinced ourselves; but are making up for a want of argumentative certainty by the loudness of our declamations, and the vehemence with which we denounce all opposition and remark. "If," they say to us, "your creed is what you assert; if it is the only true explanation of the mysteries of human existence; if it is the only key to the

course of Divine Providence in the government of the world ; if your statements of facts will really bear investigation, while those made by Protestantism break down when thoroughly tried ;—if all this is so, surely you ought to be the very first to *promote* the interests of science and literature, on the distinct ground that your creed will actually gain thereby. You ought to be the pioneers in every path of human learning, because while doubts hang about every other form of religious belief, you alone are absolutely confident that you are in the right, and that ignorance lies at the root of all opposition to your Church.” And how can we deny the force of such an appeal ? Is it not our incessant assertion, that it is nothing but want of knowledge, or defective logic, which keeps an honest man from being a Catholic ? Does any Catholic ever admit that his religion is founded on historical or scientific ignorance ? Does he ever say to an antagonist, Shut your eyes, and destroy your common sense, before you admit the claims of Rome ? How, then, can we with any consistency hold back in the race after increased knowledge ? How can we thus stultify ourselves, and convict ourselves of that very treason to the duties of a reasoning being which we so strenuously impute to our antagonists ?

If, to extend our view a little further, it is alleged that intellectual culture should be timidly encouraged, because it will lead to abuse, and make men less Catholic than ever, if they are not thoroughly sincere in seeking after truth,—we reply, How can we tell beforehand that any man is sincere or the reverse ? If this is an argument worth any thing, it tells against all study and all reasoning whatsoever. It tells against all writing and speaking in favour of the Catholic religion itself. How can we ascertain what effect the first elements of learning will have upon any given individual child ? How can we be sure, when we argue against Anglicanism or Calvinism, in the expectation of making a man a Catholic, that it will not have the effect of making him an unbeliever in dogmatic religion altogether ? Undoubtedly it has that effect sometimes ; just as the study of physical laws and of metaphysics sometimes leads men to conclude that such things as miracles are in themselves an impossibility. Rather, in this as in every thing else, we must take human nature as God has made it, and act on those principles which we know to be fundamentally sound, though the practical results may not always be precisely what we should have anticipated. As in geometry there are certain axioms and postulates which must be granted as preliminaries to every demonstration, and which must never be violated at any subject stage of deduc-

tion, so it is on questions of moral demonstration. We cannot employ the same argument to prove first one thing, and then its direct contradictory. We may use reason to place us on such an elevation that we may discern *more than* simple reason could teach us,—as we may mount a ladder to look over an obstacle so as to see many objects which nevertheless we cannot touch with our hands; but we cannot use reason against reason,—just as we cannot mount a ladder and stand on its highest round while we cut away all its lower steps. We cannot place the works of God in an antagonism to one another; nor can we pass on from one class of His works to another class, and then turn round and depreciate the value of that class to which we actually owe our advance in knowledge.

The only section of religionists, calling themselves Christians, who can consistently depreciate human learning are the votaries of the Lutheran and Calvinistic schools. A man who imagines that the emotions of his own mind, and the positiveness of his own convictions, are the tests of religious doctrine; or who believes that God hates the creatures He has made, and calls them out of nothing only to damn them eternally,—such dreamers as these may fitly denounce scientific and literary labour as vanity and as the natural foe to their theological speculations. A person who maintains the doctrines of the Atonement and the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, on the ground that he himself feels very miserable at the thought that he is an “unjustified” sinner, is naturally not very solicitous on the question of any real and external proofs of those doctrines. A mind that can be satisfied that the particular volume, and the particular translation, which he terms the Bible is *the* Bible, and is all-inspired, because in one special place he thinks he reads the dogma of “justification by faith only,” is in a condition of fatuity which renders all historical proof of Christianity as a revelation, and of the Bible as an authoritative collection of documents, perfectly needless. There used to be a story prevalent in Oxford about old Dean Gaisford, which puts into ludicrous shape the logical aberrations of those religionists who make their own personal certainty the test of revelation. “Paul says, and I partly agree with him,” said the dean, by way of commencement to one of his university sermons. And as the dogmatical old Christ-Church dignitary “partly agreed” with “Paul,” so your thorough Lutheran not only partly, but wholly, disagrees with “James.” What is it to him whether or not “James” and “Paul” have equal claims to be received as expositors of the Gospel; or whether the historical evidence for the authenticity of their

epistles is identically the same in both cases? His only test of truth is his own emotions; "Paul" makes him comfortable, "James" does not: *ergo*, first of all, "Paul" certainly means what he wishes him to mean, and "Paul" is right; "James," on the contrary, was not quite a converted character, and his letter is not perfectly safe reading without the due correction of "evangelical" notes and comments. "Profane studies" are therefore most consistently depreciated by this brilliant thinker. His religion does not depend on argument at all. He has a royal road of his own, which satisfies his limited understanding; though the calm observer is so ill-natured as to term it an unreasoning fanaticism, which may be employed alike to prove every variety of opinion that ever yet existed under the sun.

And accordingly it is found that Lutheranism, pure and simple, cares little for literature and science. The intellectual labours of Protestants have not been generally devoted to the support of Lutheranism. Its philosophical and literary giants have had no more sympathy with the characteristic dogmas of Lutheranism than with Catholicism. They have been "Protestants," it is true; but their dogmatic creed, when they have had any, has not been of the Lutheran type. Nay, in many instances, though utterly dissenting from the claims of Catholicism, they have betrayed more preference for the creed of Rome than for that of Luther in those points in which they specially conflicted. The moment Lutheranism becomes philosophical and learned, that moment it receives a colouring from some other creed. It verges towards Arianism, or Socinianism, or Anglicanism. The flagrant absurdities by which it gains its practical influence over illogical and nervous religionists repel the unprejudiced and philosophic critic, and he passes it by with a shrug and a smile.

Those of our readers who are acquainted with the writings of the Lutheran school in England, or, as popularly termed, the Evangelical, will bear us out in the assertion that its intellectual dullness is on a par with its theological self-destructiveness. Take up any book, of any kind, written by an Evangelical, whether of the Church of England or of the Dissenting sects; and if you meet with any thing better than a dreary flatness, an unimaginative prosing, an equal insensibility to the ludicrous and the beautiful, a delightful and self-satisfied ignorance of history and books in general, and an incapacity for comprehending or doing justice to the views of others, however learned and however pious, you are a lucky man. If you do meet with a ray of genius or originality, you will almost certainly find that its possessor is

not held to be "quite sound" on the great doctrine of justification, but rather slightly confused in his manner of holding "the truth as it is in Jesus." As they say that Dissent never survives the possession of a carriage and horses for two generations in one family, so it is with intellect and Lutheranism. When philosophy comes in at the door, fanaticism flies out at the window.

Turn we now to the analysis of the twin-monster, Calvinism. Calvinism is the legitimate successor of the old polytheism. What paganism did for the personal unity of God, Calvinism does for His attributes. Paganism filled the earth and heavens with a crowd of deities, each embodying some idea, or some passion, or some power: Calvinism takes the eternal attributes of the one God, divides them into distinct principles or feelings after the model of a book of metaphysics, and sets them in direct antagonism to one another. Unable to comprehend that the Divine Nature must be essentially and substantially one, and that the Divinity is not a sort of complex, though spiritual, organisation, it imagines a kind of struggle between the divine goodness, the divine love, the divine justice, the divine foreknowledge, and the divine creative power; the practical issue of which is, that the elect are saved, and the rejected are damned for ever. And just as with the gods of Greece and Rome, whatever their characteristic attributes, a leaven of caprice mingled largely with their actions, so it is with the Divinity devised by the Calvinist. The justice of God is not strict and real justice, but a determination to punish all the sons of Adam to the utmost extent which human language can attempt to describe, and much more than the human mind can comprehend. It never occurs to the Calvinist that justice requires the judge to punish the guilty *only* to the extent which they deserve, quite as truly as it requires him to punish them up to that extent. The God of heaven and earth, according to this frightful dream, is but a capricious and cruel demon: cruel, because He delights to punish His creatures to the extremest agonies which His power can inflict; and capricious, because He arbitrarily raises a portion of their number to a height of bliss which they no more deserve than do the reprobate deserve their everlasting tortures.

No wonder, then, that the Calvinistic mind can see nothing "good" in any thing that it pleases to term "natural." The great Creator has cursed the work of His own hands. Earth and skies, fire and water, plants and minerals, all that men know, or argue, or feel, or invent,—all is absolutely in the hands of that devil to whose sway the decree of their

Maker has consigned them. The earth has been handed over to Satan with nine-tenths, or ninety-nine hundredths, of its inhabitants. Nay, considering that all Papists and "unregenerate" Protestants are going direct to hell, not to mention the millions of millions of pagans, Turks, infidels, &c., who make up the majority of mankind, it is not nearly one in a hundred who can look up to his Creator as a Father and a God of love. To minds thus frightfully perverted, who can wonder that history is an old almanac, poetry an abomination, art an idolatry, and science a snare? Till a man has grasped the idea that his Creator formed him *in order that* he might be happy and wise in the knowledge and love of his God, and placed him in this world of beauty and of wonders for the special purpose that here and hereby he might be trained for eternity, how can he look upon the visible universe and upon his fellows with aught of that genuine, loving, thoughtful interest which is the very life-blood of learning and science? Why should we study the devil's own habitation, map out the foundations of his palaces, and chronicle the madness of the wretches who serve him? God, says the Calvinist, who has elected us to heaven, has consigned His works and the rest of the world to the arch-fiend who is His enemy; and why should we trouble ourselves further in the matter? "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die. We shall go to heaven, and every body else will go to hell." And that is the conclusion of the whole matter.

For ourselves, who believe that there is one God; that He has neither body, parts, nor passions; and that He did not create the universe for naught, nor bestow on us any of our faculties or senses for naught,—we place ourselves in a very different attitude in the presence of His Infinite Majesty. In nothing that has come forth from His hand can we recognise a design to mislead us in our search for Himself. Let science spread her wings for further flights; let philosophy probe deeper and deeper into every mystery; let history recall and criticise the past till not a record remains unsifted, and note every fact that humanity now presents for her analysis and classification;—still we go on rejoicing, because we recognise in all these triumphs of reason the workings of that intelligence which our Creator bestowed on us for the special purpose of being thus employed, and because it is thus, and thus only, that we can know Him, our God, Himself, and distinguish between His truth and the visions of our own dreaming imaginations. Wherever we walk, our confidence is not in ourselves, but in our God; because we know why He created us, and how it is that He is pleased to reveal Himself

to us. And thus, while those who care nothing for Him, or who have invested Him with the passions and infirmities of a man or an evil spirit, turn away from the works which He has created, we linger amidst them, never wearying of our ever-advancing knowledge, and gathering fresh confidence in His goodness from every fresh display that we behold of His wisdom and His power.

WHAT WAS THE RELIGION OF SHAKESPEARE?

No. II.

THE interpretations of the Shakespearean traditions with which we concluded our former paper were, we are afraid, sufficient to insure the condemnation of the whole argument in the minds of matter-of-fact and common-sense judges. Yet we would remind them, that a story which cannot be literally true must be either a lie or an allegory. Shakespeare's father was not a butcher, nor is it probable that the son was apprenticed to one. How, then, did tradition come by the tale? We are of those who think that all traditions are founded on some truth, some reason, or some idea; that they are either facts, explanations of facts, or enigmatical representations of facts. We feel obliged to put these Shakespearean traditions into the third class, and treat them as allegories. Neither was this foreign from the spirit of the age. The Catholics of those days, under the pressure of the penal laws, always spoke of things indirectly.

Here is an instance: Snowden, a priest, who had half consented to act as a spy on his brethren, and to send news about them to Robert Cecil, writes thus to his employer in Dec. 1591: "The merchandise we expected to come out of Seville to these parts is not at all to be talked of for these few years." On the word 'merchandise' Robert Cecil notes in the margin, "Spanish ships to invade." Again, "Nothing shall make me break my vow with you and your good landlady:" the landlady, according to the annotator, is "my father," Lord Burghley. He promises to write soon, "by some of our company of merchant-venturers that live in these parts; and for this very cause I write, this last Michaelmas departed hence eight or nine of their factors for you, by whom I writ not because of their hasty departure; and our best friends think that those twenty-eight that were sent to discover Capo

Finisterre had been better employed in Champain in France." Who would think that this meant that eight or nine of the priests who were in communication with government had gone over to England, and that in their opinion the twenty-eight just sent to Seville and Valladolid would have done better if they had gone to study at Rheims? "I pray you," he continues, "write not but of our merchandise and affairs private, leaving matters of state to statistes;" and he signs himself, "Sir Christopher Blunt's man," and directs his letter to his "friend Mr. Anthony Cotes, merchant, London."

The correspondence of Catholics in those days is a mass of enigmas similar to the foregoing. We should thank any of our readers who would interpret for us the following letter, which is most evidently hieroglyphical, and is written by some fugitive Papist to his friends:

"Thomas Perkes to his cousin St. John, and Mr. Aunyger, or either of them.

MY FRIENDS BOTH,—I would you should think that albeit I can charge you with unkindness, in that at my departure you promised me to write, yet I will not so condemn you but to think that some mishap hath chanced unto you by sickness, that men cannot keep their promise; although I would have been glad to have received the same from you, that I might thereby have understood of the health of all good fellows in those parts. Because that you have stayed to write, it maketh me sometimes judge that I am among you a man condemned in the world; but I leave this apart, and pray that as you may you will advise me of the health of my friends, *and who hath the best hawkes for river and field, and whether Comfort my dog be a good spaniel for the same.* My pastime here hath been for three weeks together to *surygys* (sic) with the mores, and doth live in the mouth of the Lene. With hearty commendation unto you and all God's fellows, your friend Thomas Perkes. From Evesham,* the 17th of June."†

Snowden employs commercial phraseology, Perkes sporting terms, to express Catholic matters. This allegorical tendency grew into an inveterate habit with the Catholics, who, from being obliged to express things indirectly, and to speak of one man under another's name, came at last to attempt to write history in the same way, as in the two famous books of Barclay, the *Argenis* and the *Satyricon*. We shall see afterwards to what political purposes these allegorical representa-

* Evesham seems to have been a favourite refuge of recusants. Sir Thomas Lucy presents several persons who had fled thither from Birmingham and Stratford to be out of the way of the Warwickshire commissioners.

† State-Paper Office, 1590, June 17.

tions were turned by historians and dramatists. But now to return to Shakespeare's history.

The first indication we have of the religion of the Shakespeare family—for religion in those days ran in the blood; you may almost tell a man's religion from his name—occurs about the year 1556, when some Warwickshire men,—Dudley, Throckmorton, Ashton, and Bedell,—conspired to transport men from England into France, and to bring them back and land them on the coast near Portsmouth, and drive out the Spaniards.* Bedell had advised Thomas White, another of the conspirators, to put all his lands in feoffment to one Cuthbert Temple, who upon trust of bargain and sale should keep them to White's use till their enterprise was done.† One Roger Shakespeare interested himself in the religious and pecuniary affairs of this Cuthbert Temple, and gave the government the following information respecting his behaviour “in absenting himself from the church:”

“The said Roger Shakespere saith that Cuthbert Temple hath not this twelvemonth and a quarter come to his parish church, and was much associate with Mr. Ashton, and Mr. Dudley, and Bedell, now in the Tower, and Glover of Coventry, whose brother of late was burned. Moreover, there is a man that oweth unto the foresaid Cuthbert Temple the sum of 700*l.*, to be paid yearly 100*l.* for seven years; he would now take 400*l.* to have it paid immediately; for what occasion he doeth it I cannot tell.”‡

Thus we have, just eight years before Shakespeare's birth, one of his name and family acting as informer against those who absented themselves from the Catholic services. There is nothing to show the relationship of Roger to John Shake-

* State-Paper Office, March 1556.

† Ibid. 1556, March 26, vol. vii. no. 37.

‡ This Roger Shakespeare had been in the service of Edward VI. Among the dockets, we find one of June 9, 1552, “Grant to Abraham Longwell, Roger Shakespere, and Thomas Best, yeomen of the chamber, of a forfeit of 36*l.* 10*s.*” Can this be in any way connected with the assertion of Dethick, who made the grant of arms to John Shakespeare, that “his parent, great-grandfather, and late antecessor, for his faithful and approved service to the late most prudent prince king Henry VII., was advanced and rewarded with lands and tenements given to him in those parts of Warwickshire, where they have continued by some descents in good reputation and credit”? It has been supposed that this assertion is true only of the Ardens,—the family of Mrs. John Shakespeare. Some light may be thrown on this by the fact that Wilmecote formed part of the Catesby property, and perhaps was granted to the Ardens on the attainder of William Catesby, Richard III.'s minister, by Henry VII. The Catesbys, however, seem to have retained the manorial rights; for we find in a roll of William Catesby's manors in Warwickshire, in the tenth year of Henry VIII., the name of Welicote (it is spelt Wellingcote in Dethick's grant of arms), for which he pays a fifteenth of 2*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.* (Chapter-House, Miscellaneous, no. 2697). The Ardens, therefore, and afterwards Shakespeare himself, were probably copyholders under Sir William and Robert Catesby.

speare; he may have been a Rowington or Packwood man. In the latter parish we meet with the name in Lucy's certificate of 1592, under the head, "Names of all such persons heretofore presented for recusants in this county as have either already conformed, or else promised conformity, or are contented to have conference." Seventeen such are named from the parish of Packwood; among them Roger Sadler, and Christopher Shackspere and his wife. We may certainly conclude that Shakespeare when he first came to London was known to James and Richard Burbage, the proprietors of the Blackfriars theatre, Warwickshire men, almost fellow-townsmen of the poet, and like him of a Catholic family. We find the name in Lucy's certificate of 1592 among the recusants of Edgbaston. It is true that then John Burbage had "faithfully promised to go to church;" but we shall have soon to inquire into the value of such a promise. In the days of Elizabeth a man connected with the stage was forced to be either an atheist, of no religion, or else a Catholic. Puritanism denounced the drama; episcopal Protestantism barely tolerated it: the Catholics used it as a means of propagating their ideas; it belonged to them; they had received it from the mysteries of the monks; it was domiciled in the Jesuits' colleges, it found its great apology and example in the dramatic ritual of the Catholic Church. Stage-players, if they were not profligates, were almost obliged to be Catholics. The profession, too, had its conveniences for persons of our religion: the haughty councillors looked down upon it as the vilest of states; though they were kind enough to take interest in the religion of serving-men and retainers, they seemed scarcely to be aware that a player could be of any religion. The heart that beat under the motley suit could not beat for any noble or high aspiration. He was encompassed with the armour of contempt; his safety lay in the proud Puritan's thinking that he was beneath notice. Another element of security which the profession offered to recusants was its vagabond character: all Catholics sought safety in a continual change of residence; their absence from their parish churches could not be noted before their presence in the parish was known; they thought by often changing their abode "to live quietly in many places, whereas they could not live quietly in one."* The wandering habit became at last such a note of a Catholic, that every wanderer was supposed *primâ facie* to be a recusant; and the first question always put to him when he was examined was, whether he

* Examination of Atkinson, State-Paper Office, July 18, 1586.

had taken the oath of supremacy, and how long it was since he had been to church. Just these two elements were the chief characteristics of players. Thus Shakespeare says of himself:

“Alas, ’tis true, I have gone here and there,
And made myself a motley to the view.”*

Not but that the profession was full of dangers also—

“O, for my sake, do not with fortune chide
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
That did not better for my life provide.”

But still it was one which, however dangerous to the morals, was a security to the person, of the recusant. Ben Jonson, as author and actor, was for twelve years a Catholic without becoming known or noticed as such.

We have supposed the poet to have fled to London on occasion of the persecution excited by the affair of Somerville and Arden: not that we imagine him to have been a very fervent Catholic; on the contrary, Somerville’s man, with whom we are inclined to identify him, professes that he went orderly to church. Catholics in those days had great difficulty in bringing up their children to follow their religion: Robert Catesby, the son of Sir William, afterwards the famous conspirator of the Fifth of November, is an instance; so is his friend Francis Tresham, and Shakespeare’s young patron, the Earl of Southampton. A strict and troublesome religion, involving all kinds of persecution and hardship, was scarcely likely to be openly professed by fast young men, who do not like even to keep the ten commandments. Persons would not incur risks of imprisonment and forfeiture of their property for refusing to go to church, who could not prevail on themselves to abstain from going to disreputable haunts. Still the young men, though “schismatics,” as they were called by the stricter Catholics, were Catholics at heart, and were banded together as much by hatred to the new religion as by love for the old. The distinguishing characteristic of this set was opposition to Puritanism; fashion, poetry, and literature were its pursuits. Shakespeare, flying from the persecution of the Puritan Lucy, known to Somerville, Arden, the Throckmortons, and the Catesbys, was naturally received into this society; and here he would be still amongst conspirators, for the murdered Francis Throckmorton was Mr. Somerville’s first cousin. A few years passed, and in 1586 Babington and his friends suffered for their intention to liberate Mary of Scotland. “We lived together,” says Chideock Titch-

* Sonnet 110.

bourne, a young poet who was one of the band, in his speech on the scaffold,—“we lived together in most flourishing estate. Of whom went report in the Strand, Fleet Street, and elsewhere about London, but of Babington and Titchbourne? No threshold was of force to brave our entry. Thus we lived, and wanted nothing we could wish for; and God knows what less in my head than matters of state!” When these young lions ruled in the Bond Street of the day, can we suppose that it was not known among them that there was a genius at the theatre at the end of the street who was connected with the Ardens, Somervilles, Catesbys, Throckmortons? or that he was neglected by persons of such pure poetical taste as Chideock Titchbourne proved himself to possess? Thus we can easily see in what society the poet may have gained his astonishing experience of high as well as low life. We cannot suppose that he was less moved than the rest of the London crowds at the harrowing barbarities practised upon Babington and his companions; or that he was an unmoved spectator of the bonfires with which the murder of Queen Mary was celebrated. We may suppose that neither his love for the government, nor his hatred of conspirators, was increased by any of these events. Luckily for himself, he was but a poor despised player, to whom as much license on matters of state was allowed as to Motley himself; and still more, who was necessary to the amusement of the persons who might have hanged him if he had been a more important personage.

In 1592, Mr. Knight supposes that Shakespeare retired for a season to Stratford to avoid the plague. This is the very year when his father was, for the second time, called to account for his recusancy by Sir Thomas Lucy, Sir Fulke Greville, Leigh, Burgoyne, and the other commissioners. Their certificate still exists in the State-Paper Office. It is divided into five parts. First, a list of recusants who continue obstinate; secondly, a list of “the names of such dangerous and seditious Papists and recusants as have been presented to us, or found out by our endeavour to have been at any time heretofore of or in this county of Warwick, and are now either beyond the seas, or vagrants within the realm;” thirdly, “the names of recusants heretofore presented in the county, but now dwelling elsewhere, or gone away on just occasion, or lurking unknown in other counties;” fourthly, “the names of recusants heretofore presented, who are thought to forbear the church for debt and fear of process, or for some other worse faults, or for age, sickness, or impotency of body;” and lastly, the “names of recusants heretofore presented, but

already conformed or promised conformity; also those contented to have conference with men learned and well affected in religion, and appointed by the commissioners with desire to be resolved of such doubts as yet make them forbear to come to church." In the first list we find the names of Dimmock (a relation of the Catesbys, and champion of England); the whole family of Middlemore of Edgbaston; Mountfort of Coleshall (the place frequented by the martyr Mountfort Scott); Bolt and Gower of Tamworth; Thomas Bates, steward to Sir William Catesby of Bushwood Park in Stratford parish, who with his son John was afterwards compromised with Robert Catesby in the Gunpowder Plot; Richard Dibdale of Stratford, who had been formerly presented for a wilful recusant, and "continues still obstinate in his recusancy," — probably a relation of Richard Dibdale the martyr, hanged for his priesthood in 1586. Other obstinate Papists of Stratford were Mrs. Jeffreys and Richard Jones. There is a long catalogue from Rowington. At Coughton, Mrs. Mary Arden, the widow of the martyred squire of Parkhall, with her servants, "continues obstinate." At Exhall we meet with one William Page, who had not been to church for three months past at least. In the second list of vagrants we chiefly meet with the names of priests, such as "Wm. Brooks, thought to be a seditious seminary priest, sometime servant to Campion in the Tower. His friends give him out to be dead, but it is thought that he is lurking in England." "Barlow, an old priest and great persuader, who uses to travel in a blue coat with the eagle and child on his sleeve," as retainer to the Stanleys; another, "suspected to be a lewd seditious Papist, wanders about under colour of tricking out arms in churches." At Stratford there was George Cook, suspected to be a seminary priest, who could not be found. At Henley-in-Arden Sir Robert Whateley, and at Rowington Sir John Appletree, both old "massing priests." The same list contains the names of Dr. Wm. Bishop, afterwards Bishop of Chalcedon, and his father and brother, and of Dr. Barrett, who were also Warwickshire men. In the list of recusants who had fled we have short histories of long hardships: Mrs. Frances Willoughby, presented first at Kingsbury, afterwards at Stratford-on-Avon, then indicted at Warwick, now fled to Leicestershire; the Middlemores, fled from Packwood to Worcestershire; John Buswell, fled from Stratford; the wife of Philip Moore, physician of Stratford, gone away to Evesham; and "one Bates, a virginal player, a most wilful recusant, now, as is said, in Staffordshire." In the fourth list we have fifteen persons from Stratford: Mr. John Wheeler,

John Wheeler his son, Mr. John Shakespeare, Mr. Nicholas Barneshurst, Thomas James alias Giles, William Bainton, Richard Harrington, William Fluellen, and George Bardolph,—all supposed to abstain from church for fear of process for debt; Mrs. Jeffreys, widow, Mrs. Barber, Julian Court, Griffin ap Roberts, Joan Welch, and Mrs. Wheeler, who all continue recusants except the last, but who are too infirm to come to church. Then in the last list,—at Solyhull, forty-eight persons had either conformed, or had faithfully promised to do so; at Edgbaston, one of the Middlemores and John Burbage were among those who had made the same promise; at Packwood, Christopher Shakespeare and his wife are in the same category; at Warwick there is William Cook alias Cawdry, probably a Stratford man; at Stratford there are seventeen names of similar persons,—the first is “Mrs. Clapton, wife of William Clapton, Esq., now dead, was mistaken, and goes now to church;” another of the number was Joan Cook alias Cawdry, a member of a family which figures in Halliwell’s biography of Shakespeare; another was Edward Green, perhaps a relation of Shakespeare’s friend the actor;* and another of these conformists is Thomas Reynolds, gentleman, whom we find elsewhere selling property in Stratford to Sir William Catesby.†

This list suggests several remarks. First, we see in what company Shakespeare must have become familiar with the names he uses in his plays. Here in this one list we have Page, Fluellen, Gower, Bates, Court, Bardolph, and Bolt. The dramatist evidently introduced the names of his acquaintances on to the stage,—and their characters too, if we believe Aubrey, who says that he and Jonson gathered humours of men wherever they came, and that he met the original of Dogberry one Midsummer night at Crendon in Bucks. Bowman the player tells us that part of Sir John Falstaff’s character was drawn from a townsman of Stratford, “who either faithlessly broke a contract, or spitefully refused to part with some land adjoining Shakespeare’s house.” It is clear that the great poet borrowed his observations from real life, as much as his plots from history and from Italian novels.

Secondly, it is clear, as John Shakespeare’s name does not occur among those who either conformed or promised conformity, that he had done nothing of the kind; if his name appears neither on the recusant rolls, nor on those partial lists of presentments which may be found in the Strat-

* Green calls Shakespeare his cousin. One Thomas Green, alias Shakespeare, was buried at Stratford, March 6, 1589-90. (Halliwell, p. 269.)

† Chapter-House, Miscellaneous, no. 3041.

ford archives, it does not prove that he ceased to be a Catholic, but that his excuse of debt had become notorious, and that on this account he was no longer troubled. May we attribute the adoption of this harmless quibble to the acute advice and London experience of his illustrious son?

Thirdly, it must not be supposed that the large list of conformists really represented the march of Protestant conviction. It was always the interest of the commissioners to make the most of their successes; their certificates are not much more credible than the reports of an Indian missionary to his paymasters at Exeter Hall. Next, even the certificate shows on the face of it the futile character of these sham conversions, extorted by fear and violence. Thus we have one Michael Commander, at Tachbrook Episcopi, who "made show of conformity and went to church, but hath since used so bad speeches as have made the commissioners to fear that he will start back like a broken bow." Of John Arrowsmith of the same place they say, "He makes some show of conformity, and goes to church; but when the preacher goeth up to the pulpit to preach he goeth presently out of the church, and saith he must needs go out of the church when a knave beginneth to preach." Again, Joan Jennings "promised conformity, but did not perform it." So John Wise, Esq., of Coleshall, did "humbly and faithfully promise conformity, and not long after came once to his parish church; but never came since." The fact is, that in 1592 the persecution had reached such a pitch in England that the Catholics were reduced to the last extremity; and many a man, to rescue the poor remnants of his patrimony for his starving wife and family, was persuaded to do violence to his conscience once or twice, and to appear at the hated services which his tyrants prescribed for him. The following pathetic letter of Cardinal Allen to the English priests will throw abundant light on this state of things, and will prove how little an occasional attendance at church made a man a Protestant.

"To my dearest Brethren in England, at London or elsewhere.

My dearest brethren and children, whom I love in the very bowels of Christ,—As the excessive troubles and pains and perils that you suffer daily and hourly in that extreme heat of persecution give me continual sorrow of mind, with all possible compassion, yea truly, with incessant desire at our merciful Lord's hands that I might deliver, if it were possible, and so pleased His Divine Majesty, you and your afflicted children with an hundred deaths and lives of mine own; so, on the other side, the daily intelligence and consideration of your notable patience, constancy, and fruitful labours in

that harvest give me in a manner equivalent comfort and consolation, with hope in God's goodness that we shall, e'er it be long, see an end of all those miseries, and Christ and the Church's enemies brought to confusion. Our brothers' blood makes forcible instance for the same from the earth, and their souls from heaven with no less efficacy cry out for the same. Doubt ye not, my most sweet coadjutors and true confessors, that our adversaries' iniquities are now in God's sight near accomplished, and at the height. On the contrary side, the number of our brethren that are to suffer for His truth is near made up, and shortly to receive, not only in the next but in this world, the worthy fruit of their labours. God Almighty, all-merciful, will not long suffer the rod of the wicked to lie so heavy upon the lot of the just, nor will let us be tempted more than by His grace we shall be able to bear, but will shorten those days of affliction for His elect's sake. Comfort yourselves herein, my loving fellows, and in the most Christian and glorious cause that ever God's priests or people suffered in. We are ashamed here* to sit *ad sarcinas*† and see you in the fight, and so bloody a combat; and we count your case a thousand times more happy and more meritorious than ours. But this is God's ordinance and disposition of all our actions and persons differently according to His will and wisdom. And we that by His appointment stay yet here, may in good time have our turn;‡ and in the mean time we succour you and the cause with prayers, sacrifice, tears, sighs, and groans, from the bottom of our heart, and with continual instance to God and man for some relief of your miseries.

Thus much I write for my own comfort and yours, and to discharge my heart of the daily sorrows, care, and solicitude, I have over you and your afflicted flock; requiring you to whom these letters may come to make all good Catholics partakers of the same, and of the infinite desire I have to serve them even with my life, expecting continually good occasion to effectuate and accomplish that which you and they most desire. And having this commodity of writing, I cannot but require and advertise you, my loving brethren that be priests, of this one thing, that I would have you use great compassion and mercifulness towards such of the laity especially as from mere fear, or for saving their family, wife, and children from ruin, are so far only fallen as to come sometimes to their churches, or be present at the time of their service; for though it be not lawful to do so much, nor in itself any ways excusable, yet such necessity in that kind of men maketh the offence less and more compassionable, yea, and more easily by you to be absolved. And therefore be not hard, nor rough, nor rigorous, nor *morosi*, in receiving again and absolving them when they confess their infirmities, and are sorry for the same, and yield some reasonable hope that they will hereafter stand more strongly, or have hope to have means

* At Rome.

† "With the baggage."

‡ He was appointed to the archbishopric of Malines, a town infested with Geux, and often dangerous to Catholics.

of escape, and not to be led into the like temptation by any moral shift which they may find,* and which the circumstances of the time, by ceasing of the persecution, may bring. Which mercy you must use though they fall more than once, and though perhaps you have some probable fear that they will of like infirmity fall again,—whereof yet we cannot be assured, because God may give them more strength; wherein no more severity is to be required of the penitent than in any other sins that be subject to the Sacrament of Penance. And perhaps, all circumstances well and discreetly weighed, in all matters that cannot be subjected to certain rules you must use much wisdom, much charity, and be assured that in most cases of this kind *tutior est via misericordie quam justitia rigoris. Sed Deus dabit nobis intellectum in omnibus.*† Yet, on the other side, you and all my brethren must have great regard that you teach not nor defend that it is lawful to communicate with the Protestants in their prayers, or service, or conventicles, where they meet to minister their untrue sacraments; for this is contrary to the practice of the Church and the holy doctors in all ages, who never communicated or allowed any Catholic person to pray with Arians, Donatists, or what other soever. Neither is it a positive law of the Church, for so it might be dispensed with on occasion; but it is forbidden by God's own eternal law, as by many evident arguments I could convince, and as hath been largely proved in sundry treatises in our own tongue, and as we have practised from the beginning of our miseries. And lest either any of my brethren might either mistrust my judgment, or be not satisfied with such proofs as have been made therein, or think myself to be beguiled therein by my own conceit, I thought not only to take the opinion of the best learned divines here, but to make all sure I have demanded the Pope's Holiness that now is his sentence, who expressly told me that to participate with the Protestants, either by praying with them, or coming to their churches or service, or such-like, was by no means lawful or dispensable; but added withal, that such as of fear and weakness, or other temporal force or necessity, should do it, ought to be gently dealt withal, and be easily absolved as aforesaid. This is his Holiness's express will and mine opinion, in which I desire all my loving fellows to agree, *ut non sint in vobis schismata.*‡ And if any there be that cannot quiet his mind in the matter, send me word, and I will take the pains to treat of the matter at large, that they may see their error. In the mean time, I hope this may serve for some taste of my loving meaning toward you all, and especially of the continual care I have that you be *unanimis in domo.*§ Remember me, your loving father in Christ, as you be all printed

* Such as excusing themselves on the ground of sickness, or fear of process for debt.

† "The way of mercy is safer than rigorous justice; but God will give us understanding in all cases."

‡ "That there may be no schisms among you."

§ "Of one mind in the house."

in my very heart. Fare ye well, my sweet children. At Rome, this 12th of December 1592. From your dearest

WM. CARD. A."*

Then follows a postscript about a jubilee, and the mode of admission into the Society of the Rosary, which we need not transcribe. The letter shows not only the loving heart of the father of the English Catholics, but also proves how small an indication of Protestantism is contained in the fact of some poor frightened recusants being driven to church by the menaces of the commissioners. Attending Protestant services under such compulsion is a sin like drunkenness, lying, or theft, under circumstances of necessity; it no more makes one a Protestant than an occasional lapse into any other fault; so that even if the absence of John Shakespeare's name from the recusant lists after 1592 be taken as an evidence of his having occasionally attended church after that date, *valeat quantum*, it no more proves him a Protestant than it proves him a prime minister. There is another document in the State-Paper Office,† which shows us what were the usual answers by which men sought to cover their recusancy, and elude the churchwardens and pursuivants. It contains the opinions of some priest, probably F. Parsons, on the lawfulness of the replies commonly made to such persons by Catholics.

First, the priest decides that it is not lawful to say, "I do go to church," when you mean only a profane going to Paul's; nor to say, "I have received," meaning that you have received your rents or your dinner; nor, "I have service at home," because your footman serves you. Nor, secondly, may you affirm that you have done an action which in moral estimation is proper to the heretics in this country,—as, I go to church, I receive the communion,—because you heard Mass and communicated at Calais; you must express this condition, otherwise it will justly be thought that you went to public service in England. But if there were any public Catholic churches in England, then you might say you had been to church; for in this case it would be the heretic's own folly to think you meant you had been to his church. Again, since "to hear divine service," and "to receive," are common to both religions, you may say, when asked whether you come to church, that you do not, but have service at home; or that you received at Easter, so that you affirm not you received "the communion." It is no more dishonour-

* State-Paper Office, 1592, Dec. 12. There are three copies.

† 1602, March 23.

able or dangerous to answer thus than if a Protestant should argue a man to be no Papist because he tells him that he prays to God, whereas the Protestant thinks that Papists never pray. But in these cases extreme care must be had not to give scandal, which cannot be when a man is not a known Catholic, or goes by an unknown name. Public confession of faith is also required when the honour of God, or the good of our neighbour, demands it: hence you must be more careful in answering before a magistrate than before a simple man, or the churchwarden coming round to inquire from house to house *pro formâ* and of custom. It is lawful to elude these interrogations, not by equivocation, which may never be used in these cases, nor by any words which seem to promise to go to church, nor by saying, "we do go to the church;" but by other indifferent speeches, as, "Think you I will live like an atheist? Doubt you that I behave myself like a good Christian, and dutiful to God and my prince? Think you I am one of the family of love? Think you that I mean not to receive this Easter? If I receive not in this place, I hope I shall in another. There is no cause why you should call me in question for going to the church. When I am at home, my master, being sickly, hath need of my continual attendance; and if he send me abroad of messages, I may, if I will, step into any church on a sudden more commodiously thereabout where my business lies. Look to yourselves; I may hear service at home; I may go to twenty places or churches: can you swear I go to none?" In such cases it is sufficient to follow a probable opinion, being neither too bold nor too scrupulous, commending the matter to God, and resolving to do nothing offensive to Him. The precepts in question bind only in particular places and times; and it is very hard just to hit the right place and time when they bind; and so an error committed *bonâ fide* and of simplicity in these cases can never be mortal, when there is no express denial of faith.

To spy a recusant through such a mist, required no small wit in the churchwarden. John Shakespeare was quite able to baffle the officers with his excuses of sickness or debt; but after 1582, we need only suppose that the versatile genius of William Shakespeare had suggested some more subtle expedients to prevent his father being found out. It would require a Protestant prejudice as stolid as that of Mr. Knight or Mr. Halliwell to maintain that Shakespeare was inferior in such a contest to the provincial Dogberrys and Vergeses that came round to inquire for recusants.

But there is evidence that John Shakespeare continued

firm in the faith in spite of all danger and persecution. We will give it in the words of one who entirely and contemptuously rejects it, Mr. Knight :

"In the year 1770, Thomas Hart, who then inhabited one of the tenements in Henley Street, which had been bequeathed to his family by William Shakespeare's granddaughter, employed a bricklayer to new tile the house ; and this bricklayer, by name Mosely, found hidden between the rafters and the tiling a manuscript, consisting of six leaves stitched together, which he gave to Mr. Peyton, an alderman of Stratford, who sent it to Mr. Malone through the Rev. Mr. Devonport, vicar of Stratford. This paper . . . consists of fourteen articles, purporting to be a confession of faith of 'John Shakspear, an unworthy member of the Holy Catholic religion.' We have no hesitation whatever in believing this document to be altogether a fabrication. Chalmers says, 'It was the performance of a clerk, the undoubted work of the family priest.' Malone, when he first published the paper in his edition of *Shakespeare*, said, 'I have taken some pains to ascertain the authenticity of this manuscript, and after a very careful inquiry am perfectly satisfied it is genuine.' In 1796, however, in his work on the Ireland forgeries,* he asserts, 'I have since obtained documents that clearly prove it could not have been the composition of any one of our poet's family.' We not only do not believe that it was the composition of any one of our poet's family, nor the undoubted work of the family priest ; but *we do not believe that it is the work of a Roman Catholic at all.* It professes to be the writer's 'last spiritual will, testament, confession, protestation, and confession of faith.' Now, if the writer had been a Roman Catholic, or if it had been drawn up for his approval and signature by his priest, it would necessarily, professing such fullness and completeness, have contained something of belief touching the then material points of spiritual difference between the Roman and the Reformed Church. Nothing, however, can be more vague than all this tedious protestation and confession, with the exception that phrases, and indeed long passages, are introduced for the purpose of marking the supposed writer's opinions in the way that should be most offensive to those of a contrary opinion, as if by way of bravado or seeking of persecution."

Nothing can be more ridiculous than for a Protestant of more than average ignorance of the real doctrines of Catholicity to pretend to tell us on *à-priori* grounds what must be, and what cannot be, our opinions or our practice. Mr. Knight's objections are most absurd. What more natural course for

* Mr. Knight must have known that the innuendo here made is perfectly groundless. The document in question is not one of Ireland's forgeries, and is moreover quite inconsistent with the absurd "confession of faith" which that person invented for the poet. The *documents* to which Malone refers are probably those that make it evident that John Shakespeare could not write, and that the handwriting is not that of any member of the family.

a person to take than to make his will before he goes into danger? If Mr. Knight had been summoned as a witness in those days, and had reason to believe that he would be racked to make him say what his torturers wanted him to say, he would naturally have first written a protest that such and such was the truth, and that whatever contradictory thing he might assert in his torments—for who can answer beforehand for his own firmness?—should be considered as unsaid and *non avenue*. What more natural thing than for a person who foresees that an attack of insanity is coming on, wherein he may say he knows not what, in view of such a misery to assure his wife or his nurse that, whatever he may say, his affection is unchanged, his love unalterable? Our poet himself founds the *dénouement* of one of his plays on a similar circumstance. When Benedict and Beatrice, in the last scene of *Much Ado about Nothing*, say that their love is “no more than reason,” only “matter of friendly recompense,” “a paper, written in his hand,” is produced, and another stolen from Beatrice’s pocket, in which they witness their affection. “A miracle!” cries Benedict; “here’s our own hands against our hearts!”—he should have said, against their mouths. Next, Mr. Knight contradicts himself: he rejects the confession, first, as having no bearing on points of controversy; secondly, as being needlessly offensive to Protestants, “as if by way of bravado or seeking of persecution.” On the contrary, the confession *does* touch on points of controversy, and is *not* made by way of bravado; for it was not meant for the eyes of the public at all. It was a protestation made, not to man, but to “God, the Blessed Virgin, the archangels, angels, patriarchs, prophets, evangelists, apostles, saints, martyrs, and all the celestial court and company of heaven.” It was no paper of controversy, but a declaration of the sentiments in which he intended to die. The writer says, that though at present “in perfect health of body and sound mind,” yet, as life was uncertain and death certain, and as he could not be sure that he might be prepared to die when he was summoned, therefore for that moment he made this spiritual testament, “hoping hereby to receive pardon for all his sins and offences.” Then follow the articles. In the fourth he protests that he hopes to die fortified with the sacrament of extreme unction; if he is hindered then, he does now “for that time demand and crave the same.” In the seventh he protests that he will bear his sickness and death patiently; and if any temptation leads him to impatience, blasphemy, or murmuring against God or the Catholic faith, he does “henceforth and for that present repent, and renounces all the evil whatsoever

he might have then done or said." In the eighth he pardons all injuries done him. In the ninth he thanks God for his creation, preservation, and vocation to the true Catholic faith (speaking as if he had never left it); and, above all, for His forbearance in not cutting him off in the midst of his sins. In the tenth he makes the Blessed Virgin and St. Winifred executrixes of his will, and invokes them to be present at the hour of his death. In the twelfth he beseeches his "dear friends, parents, and kinsfolks," whom he assumes to be all Catholics, to assist him in purgatory "with their holy prayers and satisfactory works, especially with the holy sacrifice of the Mass, as being the most effectual means to deliver souls from their torments and pains." In the fourteenth he protests that he accepts death willingly in satisfaction for his sins; and concludes by confirming his protest anew, which he says he "carries about him with the intention that it may be finally buried with him after his death."

Now is there any thing in this at all unnatural? It is not at all unlikely that a Catholic would make and write such a protestation. On the contrary, it is the practice of Catholics; and our prayer-books contain many formulæ similar to that used by John Shakespeare, which doubtless comes from some prayer-book of the period, perhaps from Parson's *Directory* itself. There is a similar form attributed to St. Charles Borromeo,* who entertained Campion, Parsons, Sherwin, and the other missionaries to England in 1580, at Milan, for a whole week, conferring with them every day. Every day that saint made certain "protestations before his angel-guardian." The first was, that he wished to die in the holy Roman faith; the second, that he would die in firm hope of God's mercy; the third, that he would partake in the merits of our Lord; the fourth, that to gain heaven he was willing to endure all pains of earth and purgatory; the fifth, that he made his angel-guardian executor of this his last will, with three requests,—that he might not die without the last sacraments; that Jesus would give him the benefit of one of His sighs; and that the Blessed Virgin would deign to turn one look upon him, and that the angel would succour him at the last hour and stand by him before the judgment-seat. The form is precisely the same; the variations are only in expression, and in the choice of those before whom the protest is made. *A priori*, therefore, there is every likelihood that the document is genuine. Malone, who had it in his own hands, and who was convinced

* See the *Cæleste Palmetum*, ed. Mechlin, 1846, p. 213. There is another form of "Protestation for Death" in the *Vita Devota*, or exercises recommended by St. Alphonsus, and, in fact, in nearly all books of devotion.

that it was no forgery, was not driven by any clamour to assert more than that it could not be the composition of any of the family. No one said it was. It was transcribed for John Shakespeare from some book of devotions, the names being properly filled up, and was kept by him in his pocket. When persecution became more prying and curious, and danger more imminent, he naturally removed it from his person: but he did not destroy it; he hid it in the roof of his house, still to witness between him and his God, and to be a standing protest that whatever weaknesses his fear might betray him into were only weaknesses, and not wilful rebellions against the faith.

John Shakespeare died in 1601. The last record about him shows that he was engaged with Mr. John Jeffreys, Mr. Thomas Wheeler, and others, in a suit which Sir Edward Greville had brought against certain burgesses of Stratford for trespass.* It is quite remarkable how persistent were parties in that little country town. The Shakespeares are always against the Grevilles, the Lucys, the Combes, and the other representatives of Protestant interests. The same people, or the same names, that we first find supporting Large, the curate of Hampton, against the men of Stratford in 1537, are still found in 1600 in opposition to the remains of the Catholic party in the town. But John Shakespeare did not live to see the end of the action; he was buried Sept. 8, 1601, on one of the chief festivals of her whom he had begged to be the executrix of his spiritual will. Did his children and kinsfolk help him afterwards with their prayers, alms, and Masses? Who can tell? The writing was hidden in the tiles. Perhaps no one knew of it; at any rate, no marble or stone was placed to commemorate him. "It would have pleased us better," says Mr. Halliwell, "had we found Shakespeare raising monuments to his parents in the venerable pile which now covers his own remains." Shall we suggest to his biographers a reason for his not doing so? They are only too greedy in swallowing any thing that promises to wipe out the least blemish from his history; let them therefore give due weight to the consideration that if John Shakespeare died a Catholic, as we may be sure he did, his son might have found it difficult to get the vicar's permission to put up any stone to his memory. There may have been a quarrel about the inscription: fifty reasons suggest themselves why the Rev. Richard Bifeild, who may have been as canting a hypocrite as Blifil himself, should have refused him not sepulture, but the honours of a monument. We do not forget the way in

* Halliwell, p. 80.

which Philip Earl of Arundel was buried in the Tower in 1595; the indignities heaped by the clergy upon Catholics did not cease with death, recusants were scarcely allowed to find the grave a resting-place.

We hoped to have been able to finish our inquiries in this paper; but matter accumulates as we proceed, and we must adjourn our further remarks to our next Number, when we hope to be able to prove satisfactorily that the poet died, as his father died, in the religion of his fathers.

Reviews.

INDIA IN 1848.

India in 1848: a Summary of the existing Administration, Political, Fiscal, and Judicial, of British India. By Arthur Mills, M.P. Murray.

THE government of British India by the Company whose death-knell has just been sounded is the greatest administrative work ever accomplished by a power not strictly national. History, ancient and modern, presents no parallel to the gradual acquisition and successful rule of that gigantic territory by the hands of a corporation of private individuals. Neither absolute sovereign nor constitutional government ever did a more wonderful thing than this society of British merchants has done during the last two centuries. And when the heats of passion and the excitements of alternating terror and triumph have passed away, we believe that in the circumstances of the very catastrophe which is giving occasion to the final abolition of the Company's power will be discerned the most unanswerable proofs of the skill, energy, and perseverance with which it accomplished its work in its day. "India in 1848," as at length transferred to the direct rule of the Imperial Crown, is a monument of provincial administration in presence of which the proudest feats in the provincial government of the old Roman empire were mere transitory efforts at colonisation. Like every other vast human work, the government of the Company may have been marked with occasional errors, faults, and crimes; and like every other political institution, it will have its bitter enemies as well as its vehement partisans. But the historian of future ages will be constrained to point to it as one of the greatest

wonders of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and will note the comparatively little interest which has been felt in its progress by the British nation at large as an illustration of the inability of every age to comprehend the significance of the events passing before its eyes.

But if the government of India is and has been a marvel, it has been recently something very like an anomaly. This word "anomaly" is just now a fashionable word. Whatever is called "normal" is accounted right; whatever is "anomalous" is wrong. A "normal school" is the model for all mankind to imitate; an "anomaly" in the franchise is inconsistent with the dignity of human nature and the happiness of millions. But what anomaly is like the anomaly of a Vernon Smith ruling, with scarcely any practical responsibility, by his own single, personal, solitary *ipse dixit*, an empire *seven times* as large as France in area, and containing nearly *six times* as many inhabitants? Nicholas, Emperor of all the Russias, ruling more than sixty millions of human beings at his own pleasure, was a tolerably singular sight to British eyes when we were fighting him. But what a sight is a Vernon Smith issuing his decrees in Downing Street, and controlling the destinies of *one hundred and eighty millions* of people on the other side of the great globe! Such are the "anomalies" which gradually spring up when the affairs of the world move on piecemeal; when living powers change, and fictions take the place of realities. Happily for mankind, anomalies, after all, are not so pregnant with evils as a sciolist science might pretend; and consequently we have *only* had to suffer the calamity of the Indian mutiny through the presence of a Smith, or others of the Smith nature, in Downing Street.

As the Smiths, however, are about to be gathered to their fathers, in company with the Directors of the Company whom they have recently in all reality superseded, it may not be uninteresting to our readers if we lay before them the principal outlines of that vast system of administration which is now to be freed from the "anomalies" of a double government; in which the semi-legitimate successors of the founders of our Indian empire were bound hand and foot to the chariot-wheels of some third-rate member of parliament. That the change about to be introduced must ultimately be beneficial, there can be little doubt. No government could carry through a measure which will practically upset the Company's system in its principles. Even should it to any extent meddle injuriously, and in place of developing its best portions, bring into lively action its more questionable elements, still it is hardly conceivable that any serious mischief should be long

upheld. Whig, Tory, or Radical alike, when once in office, will show the cold shoulder to Exeter Hall; and not even Bond Street and Belgravia will possess India as they possess the army and the Houses of Parliament, unless they prove themselves up to the mark both in hard labour and in the science of government. Conceive, indeed, the "anomaly" of consigning to the mercies of dandies or evangelicals the rule of a people who are now just what they were when Rome was built, when the ten tribes of the Jews divided from the remaining two, and seven or eight centuries at least before the period when any thing whatever is known of the inhabitants of the British isles! We speak of England as an old country, as a land of traditions and institutions and ineradicable customs. We look back to the feudalism of the dark and middle ages, here and throughout Europe, as to a sort of strange theory on the relation of man to man, so old and so thoroughly effete through inherent want of enduring vitality as to be a mere matter for antiquarian speculations. But here at this moment we are ruling an empire, the vast majority of whose millions are devoted to a theological system which existed, not only before modern European history, but before ancient European history can be said to have begun.

When the feudal political system, again, arose in mediæval Europe, an elaborate feudalism, in many respects its exact counterpart, had been existing in India for about a thousand years. European feudalism is now a thing of the past. If its traces still linger as realities any where, it is in our own country. But feudalism is still alive as the great national institution in India. The feudalism which obtained in Hindostan before the first stones of ancient Rome were laid, to this day materially determines the relations between the supreme powers and their subordinates, almost down to the cultivators of the soil itself. Those who wish to see the subject fully treated, may be referred to Colonel Todd's well-known *Annals of Rajasthan*. For the general reader it will be enough to say, that it is known that before Alexander the Great's invasion of India, the country was divided into a number of kingdoms, of various degrees of size and power; but each again made up of smaller principalities, whose chiefs owed allegiance to their common lord, holding their lands on that identical condition of military service which was the leading idea of European feudalism, and themselves possessing similar claims on the service of inferior ranks of tributaries. Nena Sahib, the local chief, in his rocky castle at Bithoor, defying the power of the supreme government, is the type of an innumerable class spread from time immemorial over the

whole of India, and even now but very gradually disappearing under the influence of European sway. Surrounded by impenetrable thickets, or perched on impregnable heights, these chieftains exercised royal powers over their immediate tributaries, only recognising superiors of their own by accepting renewals of their rights from time to time, by the payment of "fines of alienation," by the forfeiture of their rights to the crown on failure of heirs, by contributions of money for war purposes (corresponding to the "benevolences" of the European system), and by admitting the rights of the sovereign to the wardship of minors.

One remarkable point of difference, however, must be noted; and the more so because, singularly enough, it will probably be through this very peculiarity of Hindoo as compared with European feudalism that the social and political condition of Hindostan will be eventually assimilated to our own. The actual *ownership* of the soil in India was always regarded as attaching to the cultivator, whether wealthy or the reverse. Here in Europe, on the contrary, the ultimate ownership theoretically rested with the Crown, and was held by the feudal chiefs in the way of *grants*, irreclaimable, it is true, except in certain defined contingencies. How immense was the practical influence of this theory of property, from the concerns of a single homestead up to the relations of Church and State, and of the Papacy with the temporal kings of Europe, is known to every one familiar with mediæval and modern history. In India, on the contrary, the right of the chiefs, whether kings or subordinates, was confined to a tax on the produce of the land precisely similar to our present tithe rent-charges. And so thoroughly was this principle of ownership carried out, that while the chieftain, or noble, from time to time had his rights to the "rent-charge" renewed from the Crown, the cultivator was a *bonâ-fide* freeholder, and could sell, mortgage, or alienate his possession according to his pleasure.

Another of the peculiarities of the Hindoo character, which the Company, and every man who has had any pretensions to statesmanship, has carefully recognised, is its deep-seated aversion to amalgamation with any system foreign to its own. Whatever be the elements in human nature to which the Brahminical religion appeals, it is undeniable that, once rooted into the mind and habits of a nation, it has refused to coalesce with any thing unlike itself to an extent, we believe, without parallel in the history of creeds. How long it has actually existed, must remain a matter for mere speculation; but the most moderate computations assign it a life of

nearly three thousand years. Before its power of passive resistance the fury of Mahometan proselytism quickly subsided into ill-humoured apathy. The relations established between the conquering invaders and the vanquished people varied with their aims and circumstances; but they never issued in an amalgamation of race with race, laws with laws, or creed with creed. It is now nearly nine centuries since the fiery fanaticism of the new Arabian imposture burst upon Lahore, smote the idolaters of Hindostan, and robbed them of their treasures. Lord Ellenborough, when he carried off the gates of Somnauth amidst the wrath of Brahmins and the laughter of Britons, was but a humble imitator of the feats of the first Mahometan invader of India in the identically same spot. "Having placed guards round the walls, and at the gates," says Ferishta, the Persian historian of the sixteenth century, "Mahmood entered Somnauth, accompanied by his sons and a few of his nobles and principal attendants. On approaching the temple, he saw a superb edifice built of hewn stone. Its lofty roof was supported by fifty-six pillars, curiously carved, and set with precious stones. In the centre of the hall was Somnat, a stone idol fifteen feet high, two-thirds of which were sunk in the ground. The king, approaching the image, raised his mace and struck off its nose. He ordered two pieces of the idol to be broken off and sent to Ghiznee" (his own capital), "that one might be thrown at the threshold of the public mosque, and the other at the court-door of his own palace. These identical fragments are to this day to be seen at Ghiznee. Two more fragments were reserved to be sent to Mecca and Medina. It is a well-authenticated fact, that when Mahmood was thus employed in destroying this idol, a crowd of Brahmins petitioned his attendants, and offered a quantity of gold if the king would desist from further mutilation. His officers endeavoured to persuade him to accept of the money; for they said that breaking one idol would not do away with idolatry altogether, that therefore it could serve no purpose to destroy the image entirely; but that such a sum of money given in charity among true believers would be a meritorious act. The king acknowledged that there might be reason in what they said; but replied, that if he should consent to such a measure, his name would be handed down to posterity as 'Mahmood the idol-seller,' whereas he was desirous of being known as 'Mahmood the idol-destroyer;' he therefore directed the troops to proceed in their work. The next blow broke open the belly of Somnat, which was hollow; and discovered a quantity of diamonds, rubies, and pearls, of

much greater value than the amount which the Brahmins offered."

This story may be taken as an illustration of the spirit of the first Mahometan conquerors of the Hindoos. Their aim was extermination and plunder, not permanent possession or settled government. When, subsequently, a Mussulman rule was set up over a large portion of Hindostan, their attempts at individual conversion, and at the abolition of the political and judicial code of Brahminism, rapidly subsided into a recognition of the creed and the customs of the conquered race. They slew myriads, both in battle and in cold blood; they spared no tortures, no confiscations, no insults; but they made few conversions: and finally they contented themselves with imposing a capitation tax, as the ransom of blood, upon the obstinate Hindoos; and that form of social and political life grew up which has lasted to this very hour. Agriculture has remained the characteristic occupation of the Hindoos, as commerce has been that of the Mahometans; and they have remained without intermarriage, with the Koran and the laws of Brahminism ruling the administration of justice each for its own votaries. Polytheism and monotheism have endured side by side for century after century, without a parallel in any times save the patriarchal, when we must suppose that the worship of one God was preserved from generation to generation in families and individuals, rather than in races and in separate nations.

To return now to the administration of this singular empire by our own fellow-countrymen of the East India Company. It has been their policy from the first, taken as a whole, to recognise the existing state of things in Hindostan, whether Mahometan or Hindoo, as an established fact; and to govern their subjects as far as possible on their own inherited systems of social, judicial, and fiscal life. That on any other system they could have won, much less maintained, their position in India, we believe to be perfectly impossible. What was impossible to resident Mahometan conquerors, restrained by no European ideas of gentleness or policy, and armed with apparently irresistible strength, we may rest assured would have been still more out of the power of a company of traders from the other side of the globe, backed though they might have been with all the wealth and strength of the British empire. Whether or no, however, it would have been possible to have governed Hindostan through the agency of English codes and English customs, as a fact, the Company, supported by the British nation, has acted on a totally different method. And as what they have done until now will

certainly be done for the future by the immediate action of the Crown, a sketch of the system of Indian administration is in no sense to be regarded as a piece of antiquarian history. It will therefore, we imagine, be none the less interesting to our readers if we borrow from Mr. Mills' valuable volume an outline of the elaborate machinery on which we now govern that mighty empire.

India in 1848, the general title of Mr. Mills' book, is indeed an incorrect description of his work, for it is nothing more than a collection of statistics and dry details: none the less valuable on that account, if judged on its own merits; but having no pretence whatsoever to bringing "*India in 1848*" before our eyes. It is, in truth, a book for the library and for reference rather than for reading throughout; but in its own line it is so complete, that we do not wonder at the rapidity with which its first edition has been taken up by the public. It is only through the strange want of interest which the general public has too often displayed in our provincial and colonial possessions, that the publication of such a work could have been delayed till the present time. That want of interest has indeed become proverbial; and it may be taken for granted, that of the innumerable readers who have studied the newspaper-accounts of the recent mutinies with a new-born intensity of interest, the overwhelming majority were totally in the dark as to the meaning of the very designations applied to the various officials of our Government in Hindostan. We have been reading of "Residents" and "Commissioners," and "Contingents," and "Native States," and "Governors," and "Governors-General," and of the "Supreme Council," and of the "Court of Directors" and the "Board of Control" at home; but to how many readers, even of the really educated classes, have these terms conveyed any ideas more accurate than those purely Hindoo words which describe the various grades of local officials in the civil and military life of the country?

Within the territory, then, over which the British Crown is supreme, there are three distinct divisions. In two of these we are the sole and absolute rulers of the people, as truly as we possess our own islands of Great Britain and Ireland. These two are termed "Regulation" Provinces, and "Non-Regulation" Provinces. The former are administered solely by members of the "Civil Service," under the published *Regulations and Acts* of the Indian Government. These were our first acquired territories; and though less extensive in area than both the "Non-Regulation" and the Native-governed territories, are more populous than both of these two

latter combined. They are classed as the Bengal, the North-West, the Madras, and the Bombay provinces; and their united population amounts almost to one hundred millions of souls. Thus by far the most important portion of our Indian empire comes under the division in which the administration is carried out on a definitively fixed and published code.

The more recently acquired districts are placed, some under the immediate administration of the Governor-General in Council, and some under the different "Regulation" provinces to which they lie contiguous. Those under the Governor-General are twice as populous as all the rest combined; and comprise, with others, the important states of the Punjab, Oude, and the Cis-Sutlej territory. These districts are governed by special and varying instructions issued from time to time by the Supreme Government, the established code in use in the older possessions being naturally not always applicable to their transitional condition. There is also another point of difference between the government of the Regulation and the Non-Regulation provinces, in the participation of the military with the civil servants of the Company in the administration of the latter.

Thirdly, there are the "Native States" which have been brought into some species of feudal relationship with the British power, and which are therefore no longer allies, but, strictly speaking, subjects and dependants. They are bound to us by treaties and engagements of various descriptions, but in every case as inferiors to a superior. They are generally entitled to our protection on condition either of paying a certain tribute, or of furnishing us with a body of troops termed a Contingent, to be employed by us at our own discretion. In some cases other less onerous conditions have been granted them, in return for the cession of a portion of their territory; while in others, as Mysore, the merest shadow of independence is all that remains, the entire internal administration of the territory being in our hands.

In all these native states the interests of the British empire are guarded by the presence of a European servant of the Company. These functionaries, who may be either soldiers or civilians, are usually called "Residents." In Mysore the title is "Commissioner;" in Kolapore it is "Political Agent." It is obvious that the exercise of the functions of these Residents must often be a matter of considerable delicacy; and, in fact, upon their energy, knowledge, tact, and courage, the maintenance of satisfactory relations between the British Government and the subordinate native princes mainly depends. Of course each Resident is directed

by instructions from head-quarters; but in so peculiar a state of things individual character is often of far more consequence than the fixed letter even of the wisest instructions from a distance. Were these important missions to be confided to the chances which govern many of our own Home and Colonial appointments, the mischief would be incalculable; and it is from a dread, however exaggerated, lest those and similar situations should become matters for jobbing nepotism and aristocratic rapacity, that such fears have been expressed lest the coming changes in our Indian system should be suicidal in their results. The names of many of these states and their princes have grown familiar to all readers during the recent troubles; and a brief mention of their mere population will show at once the perils of placing our relations with such powers in the hands of rash or ignorant theorists.

The entire population governed by Scindia, in Central India, whose capital is Gwalior, is but three millions; yet what a fatal prominence has been won by the "contingent" supplied by him according to his treaties with our Government! The Nizam of the Deccan governs a far larger multitude, amounting to nearly eleven millions. Holkar, on the contrary, has less than a million of subjects. Gholab Singh rules over three millions; and the various Rajpoot states together number more than seven millions. Such are the elements of difficulty yet remaining in the very centre of our Indian empire. The general reader, perhaps, will be startled at such a phrase. That our position in Hindostan should still be so "anomalous" as to allow the use of such words as the "*very centre* of our empire" to be applied to vast territories in which we are not the actual governors of the population, will probably surprise many an "intelligent reader." We can imagine the astonishment of such a simple-minded politician on taking up the revenue-map prefixed to Mr. Mills' volume, and beholding a proof that of the entire geographical area of Hindostan, not much less than one-half,—namely, about three-sevenths,—is to this very day held by native princes, and administered by their supreme governmental authority. These districts are, indeed, far less populous than those immediately under the British sway; but their mere physical magnitude evidently constitutes an element of first-rate importance in the government of our Indian empire, placed as they are in various spots all over its surface, from its heart to its extremities.

Up to the present time this immense empire has been governed on the theory that it was simply the private property

of a corporation of merchants. Undoubtedly this theory has been more and more encroached upon by the successive Acts of Parliament by which the various charters of the East India Company have been renewed. Year after year has seen the gradual substitution of imperial government for private administration, until a system which originally was the same as that on which a large landholder appoints watchers to protect his property, and enters into commercial relations with neighbouring landlords, has developed into an apparatus of administration of truly imperial magnitude. The Court of Directors, now about to cease for ever, was originally the natural representative of the body of Englishmen trading in India. They represented them in the same way as the House of Commons now represents the property of Great Britain and Ireland. On this principle, too, every person who possessed a certain amount of India stock, or, in other words, had a certain money claim upon the revenues of the trading company, had a voice in the election of these Directors. So, too, it was natural that the Directors should appoint,—of course subject to the approval of the Crown,—some important personage to act as their representative in India, and to exercise those local powers of administration and legislation which would be impracticable here on the other side of the globe. In the same way they have appointed the subordinate chiefs in various departments, becoming themselves more and more a kind of representative of the imperial power, just as their private “possessions” grew more and more into a political portion of the British empire itself.

In the mean time, it was impossible that the direct action of the Imperial Government should not also keep pace with this rapid growth of the Company’s possessions. The Company would have been infinitely too dangerous a subject of the Crown, if every advance in political importance had not been accompanied with a corresponding increase of supervision on the part of the nation itself. Hence the complicated machinery of checks on the irresponsible action of the Directors introduced from time to time, in addition to the withholding from them the appointments of those functionaries who hold offices of a more immediately imperial description. That the Crown should appoint the commanders of the troops which itself, so to say, lent to the Company to assist it in ruling and defending its territories, was but natural. Besides this restraining power, however, it was necessary that, without destroying the legislative and administrative functions of the Directors, the government of India should become nominally and really one of the departments of the British State, shar-

ing in all those ministerial changes which are an essential element in the British Constitution. Hence that singular invention called the "Double Government," against which so long and loud an outcry has been raised, and which is now at length doomed to die. That this double government, nevertheless, was by far the best practical device which could be invented in the very peculiar circumstances of the case, we entertain little doubt. To subject India to the immediate administration of the Crown, like an English county, would have been equivalent to an utter loss of the whole to the empire; while it was out of the question to permit the erection of such a literal *imperium in imperio* as would have been the uncontrolled government of India by the Company and its Directors. The most obvious expedient was accordingly the creation of a "Board of Control," whose duty it should be to take care that the Directors did their duty as they ought to do, neither imperilling Indian nor imperial interests through the vagaries of ignorant, selfish, or despotic irresponsibility.

To estimate the merits or demerits of this device as a matter of statesmanship, it is only fair to those who devised it to recall the circumstances of the day which saw its birth. Now, seventy years ago the world did not move at its present pace. When it took three days to travel from Exeter to London, people were not prepared to condemn a machinery whose principal practical evil was that it involved much delay in action. A Board of Control at the west end of London could surely, it was imagined, so contrive to arrange its action in conjunction with a Court of Directors at the east end, that no great harm should happen to a country which could only be reached by a voyage of almost fabulous length. Moreover, that overhauling of the proceedings of Companies' Boards and Administrations, which is happily enough the fashion nowadays, was not so much in vogue when Mr. Pitt was king. The nation looked with merciful eyes, scarcely needing to wink hard at the questionable conduct of select bodies of any description. Monopoly was held to be a sound principle of business, and privacy the very soul of official energy and action. As yet the *Times* was not, nor its correspondents, from "anti-Loyola" up to "Jacob Omnium;" and accordingly the actual inconveniences which would result from a complicated machinery like that which still regulates the joint action of the Board and the Directors was accounted of little moment.

But in the year 1858 human life will brook no delays, no concealments, no privileged abuses, at least in theory; and therefore the double government is at length drawing its last

breath, and deservedly so, as few persons will doubt, if they will only take the trouble to read the paragraphs in which Mr. Mills details the form of the communications which are incessantly going on between the Board and the Directors. We had thought of quoting his account at length; but reflecting that not one reader out of a dozen would have patience to peruse the three or four pages they would occupy, we shall content ourselves with referring those who list to the second chapter of Mr. Mills' volume.

But now, what is this "Board of Control for the affairs of India?" Who are the wise, learned, and energetic statesmen to whom the action of the Crown is confided in its efforts to make the Directors of the Company do their duty? Under Lord Palmerston the "Board" was—Mr. Vernon Smith; it is now Lord Ellenborough. There is really no such thing as a "Board" at all. It is what the lawyers call a "corporation sole." It is one man, and one man only. Theoretically the Crown is empowered to appoint any number of persons it pleases as "Commissioners for India;" and it is enacted that the First Lord of the Treasury, the principal Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Lord President of the Council, and the Lord Privy Seal, shall be *ex-officio* members of this Board. But practically all these personages are dummies. They take no part whatever in the action of the Board; and the president does every thing on his own responsibility. The idea that the Government, as a government, shall control the Directors, is not recognised. Whoever may be the individual chosen by the lucky party in office for the day, he for the time is the sovereign of India.

Unfortunately, too, the office is one which has been rather looked down upon than otherwise. It falls practically to politicians of the second and third rank: such at least has been its fate since the Reform Bill. Before that time the list of presidents of the Board of Control shows a fair proportion of names of the most distinguished statesmen of the day; but since 1830, when the Low-Church party for the first time saw India in the hands of a Whig and an Evangelical, and Mr. Charles Grant succeeded Lord Ellenborough, mediocrity, or something worse, has been the universal rule which has lifted a man into this almost royal position. The flashing and unsteady light of Ellenborough has been the only ray which has illumined the dull twilight of the India Board now for eight-and-twenty years past.

What *can* happen in the way of statesmanship through the perversity and dullness of a powerful official has been shown us in the recent exposures of Mr. Smith's conduct in

respect to Ali Moorad, the Ameer of Scinde. What may be the real merits of this individual, we do not presume to say. But whether we take the Pottinger view, that he is a scoundrel; or the Napier theory, that he is a model of persecuted virtue,—of the “fix” into which the double government can draw the administration of India when a weak, timid, and conceited mind gets possession of the Board of Control, there cannot be two opinions. Practically, the “Board” has simply fulfilled the function of “doing” the Directors. Let us hope, however, that henceforth the government of India will fall to the lot of statesmen; and that whatever knowledge, prudence, and energy has been displayed by the Directors, will be displayed with increase in the new “Council,” or whatever it may be, which will be formed no doubt very much out of the same materials as the Directorate was formed.

Whatever be its constitution, it is scarcely possible that it should make any fundamental changes in the machinery by which India is governed in India itself. The “instruments” of this government, as Mr. Mills terms them, are threefold; the civil service, the military and naval, and the ecclesiastical. On each of these three a few sentences and figures will be enough to put the uninformed reader in possession of the more important details.

The Civil Service is divided into two classes: 1. The Covenanted Service,” consisting of a body of men who enter into a “covenant” with the Company, prescribed by ancient form to the effect “that they shall obey all orders; that they shall discharge all debts; and that they shall treat the natives of India well.” This select body performs all the higher class of government duties; and it consists solely of Europeans, who have to pass an examination before leaving England, and to subject themselves to a second training on arriving in India. Formerly none could enter this covenanted service except those who on the nomination of Directors had been admitted to a preliminary two-years’ training at Haileybury; but it is now open to public competition in a prescribed examination.

2. The “Uncovenanted Service,” which consists of natives and half-castes, as well as Europeans; and which fills the subordinate offices of various kinds, whether connected with the collection of the revenue or the administration of justice—the two grand divisions of the Indian internal government. This class is not submitted to any preliminary training, nor do they enter into any distinct covenant with the Company.

The salaries of the two classes of services are, of course, very different. Those of the “covenanted” vary from 500*l*.

to 10,000*l.* a-year,—very different sums, it must be remembered, in a country where the cost of living is so great to Europeans from what they would be in Europe: while those of the uncovenanted range between 100*l.* and 900*l.* a-year. In this latter class there are only from two to three thousand Europeans and half-castes engaged. The number of natives, on the contrary, thus employed is very large. Almost the whole of the judicial administration of the *lower* courts is in their hands. Not only the Vakeels, or pleaders, but the three grades of judges called Principal Sudder Aumeens, Sudder Aumeens, and Moonsiffs, amounting to about seven hundred, are natives. Such also are the collectors in the salt, opium, and customs departments, and the land-revenue officers, not less altogether than about 1200 in number. Then there is a class of native “sub-assistant surgeons,” with a native assistant doctor, to every regiment. Add to them an immense crowd of native subordinate police and revenue officers, in Bengal alone numbering above 40,000; with “village watchmen,” a still more numerous class. These figures show how thoroughly the British administration is woven into the whole fabric of Indian political life; and they help to account for the striking abstinence of the native *population*, as a whole, from the recent insurrection of the military class. Occasionally, too, their salaries rise much above the sums mentioned above. A native judge of the Small-Cause Court at Calcutta recently received as much as 1560*l.* a-year. It should be mentioned, further, that the native judicial appointments are usually, but not always, held by Mahometans.

On the details of the military and naval establishments a few figures will suffice. First in numbers come the Company's native troops, officered of course by Europeans. At the present time the revolt has diminished this army from about 250,000 to about 120,000 men.

The European forces of the Company, previous to the losses in the mutiny, amounted to 22,000, including engineers, artillery, cavalry, and infantry.

The queen's troops now in India, and on their way out, amount to about 63,000 men.

Lastly, the contingent troops furnished by native princes by treaty to the Company, and commanded by British officers, amounted, previous to the mutiny, to about 52,000 men.

The naval force is but small. Its duties consist chiefly in surveys of the coast and the prevention of piracy. Its total strength is some fifty or sixty steamers and sailing vessels, and from 4000 to 5000 men, Europeans and natives.

The ecclesiastical establishment professedly exists solely

for the benefit of the servants of the Company, and has no reference to the general Indian population. Mr. Mills' account of this portion of his subject is, however, very meagre. It appears that the Company maintains three Anglican bishops, and 135 Anglican and Presbyterian chaplains. It also assists in the support of three Catholic Bishops, and seventy-eight Catholic priests. From Colonel Sykes' recent speech in the House of Commons in defence of the Company, it appeared that the payments to the Catholic clergy had increased in a very much more rapid ratio than those to the Protestant during the last twenty years. The payments are still far from being equal in proportion to numbers and necessities; but it is a fact most significant of the change in popular feeling, that the chief advocate of a great company could publicly defend it as not insensible to the claims of Christianity on the ground that it had largely increased its payments to the Roman Catholic priesthood. The argument also was received with perfect equanimity by the House of Commons.

In the legal and judicial administration of India the general British policy in respect to conquered or ceded territories has been adopted. The laws and system of jurisprudence, whether Mahometan or Hindoo, in force at the time of our entering on our possessions, have been recognised as valid till superseded by the supreme authority of our government. British-born subjects and their descendants are subject to British law, as administered in the supreme courts of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, except in cases of oppression of the natives or judicial malversation, which are cognisable by the ordinary tribunals. These latter also try civil suits between natives and British-born subjects. In the case of natives the courts administer to every man the law of his own religion, country, or tribe. Where the plaintiff and defendant are of different tribes, the case is to be decided by the local custom of the country, or the law of the defendant. In this last condition we recognise the application of that fundamental idea of justice which is characteristic of our national law, namely, that if any difference is to be made between the accused and the accuser in the conduct of a trial, it is to be to the advantage of the accused. Hence it is that we hold that every man is to be accounted innocent till he is shown to be guilty. Hence the difference of principle which underlies the differences of opinion between the French government and our own countrymen on the subject of "suspected" political criminals. Hence, too, that rule in duelling that the choice of weapons shall rest with the person who is challenged.

In native civil suits, the European district, or Zillah, judges, who try appeals and important suits, are allowed to avail themselves of native assistance in one of the following ways :

1. By a Panchayet, or court of arbitrators, usually five in number,—whence the term “chosen by the parties;” who inquire into points submitted to them by the judge, apart from the court, and report accordingly.

2. By native assessors, who sit with the judge to make observations and assist in examining witnesses.

3. By a jury, who deliver a verdict.

In all these cases, however, the decision rests solely and exclusively with the judge; arbitrators, assessors, and jury fulfilling only the functions of a council.

We now come to the important and interesting question of revenue. Probably the reading world is not generally aware that of all the British dependencies India alone has hitherto borne the entire cost of her civil and military administration. Here is a fact which alone is an eulogy on the administration of the Company which ought to count as of no small weight with a nation that *professes*—whatever be the truth—to care for economy as much as any nation in the world. This result, says Mr. Mills, has been attained under a revenue system inherited from our Mahometan predecessors, engrafted by them on ancient Hindoo customs, and modified from time to time under British rule by a series of regulations. It may therefore be safely said that this system of taxation is beyond all comparison the oldest in the world in which Europeans have any share. And we cannot help pausing to note the contradiction which it supplies of the common assertion of despotic sovereigns and their supporters, that popular institutions tend to a headlong and revolutionary destruction of the past. Our government of India may be added to the many proofs derived from our social and political state at home, which go to show that there is scarcely another European nation whose present life is so deeply rooted in the institutions and traditions of the past.

The entire gross revenue of British India for the year ending April 30th, 1857, was 29,167,457*l*. By far the principal item in this amount, being no less than 16,602,908*l*., is derived from the land, as we have already stated, in the form of a species of rent-charge, assessed very much on the principle of our tithe-commutations. The varieties in detail in the manner of collecting it are considerable. Sometimes the Government stands in immediate relations with the actual cultivators, whether individually or in groups. Sometimes the occupants of the soil settle with the Government through the

intervention of a sort of middleman. In Scinde, until a few years ago, the revenue was paid in kind, just like our old tithes. The mischief to the tenants was serious, as the Government sold its share at artificial prices, through its influence as the chief grain-dealer in the country. This system is now being rapidly superseded by cash assessments; and it seems very possible that this great improvement in the condition of the people resulting from British rule, has materially contributed to the tranquillity of the newly acquired-province all through the late disasters. This opinion, however, we should add, is not given by Mr. Mills, nor, indeed, are any of those on which we have ventured, his book being purely and solely statistical.

Opium furnishes the item next in importance, reaching to 4,487,269*l*. It is cultivated by government capital, and sold to purchasers, just as a farmer sells his wheat and barley. Duties raised on opium grown elsewhere, and passing through the British dominions, form an important element in the total sum raised on the drug. That which is sold for the Government is purchased by merchants in India on their own account, or for mercantile houses in China, and then shipped for the Chinese coast or Hong Kong.

Salt, either as produced by a government monopoly, or in the way of excise, produces above 2,000,000*l*. The customs yield another 2,000,000*l*.; and miscellaneous sources, including subsidies from Native States, produce between 3,000,000*l*. and 4,000,000*l*., and raise the entire income, exclusive of the cost of collection, to more than 29,000,000*l*.

This revenue is expended as follows, taking round numbers:

Charges of collection	£6,000,000
Military and naval expenditure	11,000,000
Civil, judicial, and police	5,000,000
Public works	1,500,000
Interest on bond-debt in India	2,000,000
Charges defrayed in England, including interest on home bond-debt, dividends to proprietors of India stock, payments on account of Queen's troops, and es- tablishment; and charges of East India House and Board of Control	3,500,000
Allowances and assignments to native princes, under treaties	1,000,000

Total, about £30,000,000

One more important class of works remains to be specified, that relating to "institutions" and public works.

First, there are three Universities, established by the Company, at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, on the system of the London University, empowered to grant degrees to all who produce certificates from certain affiliated institutions; comprising all the principal colleges and schools in India, without the slightest reference to religious creed. What influence these Universities may exert, it is quite impossible to foresee, as they have been but a very few years in operation.

Further, all existing schools, whether vernacular or Anglo-vernacular, are entitled, on certain prescribed conditions, to grants in aid, on the principle recognised in our poor-schools in England. The system is also managed, as at home, by Directors of Public Instruction, with the usual machinery of inspectors and sub-inspectors. The total number of these schools, in 1853, amounted to no less than 1657, containing, however, only about 65,000 scholars, or an average of about sixty pupils to a school. But now observe to whom these schools for the most part owe their existence. Mr. Mills tells us that these schools have been chiefly established by the following twelve societies, which, with one single exception, are not only Protestant, but of the Low Church and Dissenting type of Protestantism. That single exception is also Protestant, but it is of the old-fashioned High Church of England school. We give the names of these societies, that Catholics may see what Protestantism, "pure and undefiled," is doing in Hindostan. The dates indicate the years in which each society first commenced its operations:

- 1727. Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.
- 1793. Baptist Missionary Society.
- 1805. London Missionary Society.
- 1812. American Board of Missions.
- 1814. Wesleyan Missionary Society.
- 1815. Church Missionary Society.
- 1822. General Baptist Missions.
- 1830. Established Church of Scotland.
- 1830. Free Church of Scotland.
- 1830. Basle Missionary Society.
- 1834. American Presbyterian Mission.
- 1840. American Baptist Mission.

These twelve societies have in their employment about 400 missionaries, and profess to have about 100,000 native Christians in connection with them.

The chief existing higher government educational institutions are the following: the College at Calcutta, established by Warren Hastings, for the study of Arabic and Persian, to

which English has since been added. In 1854 there were 314 pupils in this college, all Mahometans. In 1816 a Hindoo college was organised by a native committee, for giving an English education to Hindoos, in which the pupils are taught law, medicine, and civil-engineering; Sanscrit and medical colleges, and an hospital at Calcutta. Somewhat similar institutions exist in Bombay and Madras. Parliamentary returns show that the total sum expended in aid of native education in India in the year 1853 amounted to about 1,000,000*l*.

The public works now completed are :

Ganges canal : nearly 500 miles.

East and West Jumna canals : nearly 500 miles.

Punjaub canals : nearly 450 miles.

Many irrigation-works in the Presidency of Madras.

Trunk roads : between 3000 and 4000 miles.

Railways : between 200 and 300 miles.

Electric telegraphs : about 4000 miles.

Such are the chief elements of that gigantic apparatus of government, which has been the gradual growth of less than two centuries; for though the Company began to trade and possessed factories at an earlier date, it was only in 1668 that it obtained possession of the island of Bombay, transferred to it by the British Crown, which had itself only held it since 1661, when Charles II. received it as a portion of the dower of the Infanta Catherine of Portugal.

What will be the effects on India of the abolition of the Court of Directors, as administrators of this enormous territory, it were vain to speculate. Will India be jobbed for the benefit of the younger sons of the nobility? or will it remain practically in the hands of the professional and mercantile classes? Will common sense and the principle of secular education guide the intercourse of the Government with the natives in all those matters where their religious feelings will be most sensitive? or will the fashionable Luthero-Calvinistic fancies of the day be permitted to imperil our scarcely-rooted dominion over 180,000,000 of souls? On the continuance of a sound system, freed from the hindrances of a somewhat cumbrous machinery at home, we believe that it depends whether India is to become more and more a source of wealth and power to England, or to degenerate into the condition of the Provinces of the Lower Roman Empire,—a reminiscence of past glories, and a source of present decay.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF EDMUND BURKE.

History of the Life and Times of Edmund Burke. By Thomas Macknight. 2 vols. Chapman and Hall. 1858.

THIS is a book especially interesting to Catholics, both on account of the subject and of the manner of treating it ; for Burke was the wisest, the most sincere, and the most disinterested of all the advocates of the Catholic cause ; and Mr. Macknight is the most impartial and unprejudiced of his biographers. Of the many who have preceded him, none can be said to have been equal to the subject. The memoir published immediately after the death of Burke, together with the *Observations on the Conduct of the Minority*, is a mere sketch of seventy pages ; but it contains much accurate information, and has been made the foundation of the article in Knight's *English Cyclopædia*, the most satisfactory account of Burke yet published. M'Cormick's *Memoirs*, written in the dissenting and revolutionary interest, are a storehouse of all the calumnies ever uttered against him. Bisset's *Life of Burke* was successful at the time, and was even translated into French ; but although Mr. Macknight declares that it is far from being the worst book on the subject, it is certainly not the best, and is now almost as completely forgotten as his *History of George III.* A life by Mr. Peter Burke is a book of moderate pretensions, and of still less value. Dr. Croly's *Memoirs* are only remarkable as an attempt to extract a system of Tory politics from the writings of the great Whig statesman. Prior's popular but dull biography contains in the last edition a tolerable account of Burke's personal history. Its chief defect is, that in the case of such a man as Burke this is not enough. In order to be fully understood, his life must be viewed as a part of the history of the times whose chief ornament he was, and which he so greatly influenced. The lives of all great public men are inseparable from their times, and a biography which refuses to be a history is inevitably imperfect. Mr. Macknight's horizon is far wider than Mr. Prior's ; and he has not only written well on the history of George III., but he has also shown great industry in collecting minute facts relating to Burke's private life. He refutes, for instance, the report of Burke's having been an unsuccessful candidate for the professorship of logic at Glasgow ; and he zealously vindicates his character from the imputations cast upon it by his acquaintance with the celebrated

Peg Woffington. The care bestowed on these minute and not very necessary investigations, and the habit of speaking fully of all persons and events that Burke was in any way connected with, have occasioned an excessive diffuseness, which would be a blemish if it were possible to complain of the length of a biography of our greatest statesman, which is considerably exceeded by the lives of such persons as Dr. Chalmers and Hannah More. But we must also regret a certain pompous grandiloquence, and some errors of taste which we should hardly have expected in so practised a writer.

Mr. Macknight is at great pains to vindicate for Burke the authorship of several works that are not generally understood to be his. He considers the *Account of the European Settlements in America*, which is included in the American edition of Burke's works, to be almost entirely by him. When the Seven-Years' War was over, *A Compleat History of the late War* was published, consisting of extracts from the *Annual Register* of the six preceding years. This was unquestionably Burke's. That he was the originator, and for many years the chief compiler, of the *Annual Register*, is well known. Mr. Macknight affirms that the historical portion was for the most part written by him, at least till the close of the American war; but M'Cormick, who was his contemporary, states that his connection with it lasted till 1789, when the work passed into the hands of his friends Dr. Laurence and Dr. King. The extraordinary richness and energy of Burke's mind bestow a particular value upon every fragment that remains of his writings. We must therefore re-echo Mr. Macknight's wish for a more complete collection of his works, which would, in our opinion, be of greater service than the most elaborate biography. It ought to contain twice as much as any of the existing editions. Besides a judicious selection from the *Annual Register*, and the various pamphlets and essays which have not yet been collected, it would include all the speeches, of which so many fragments remain in the Parliamentary History and the Cavendish Debates. Many of these short and imperfectly reported speeches, as well as some of his private letters, give an idea of his genius at least as high as his greater works. Some of his later speeches, which were not published by him, and some of the letters in the collection which appeared in 1844, are more profound than any thing that can be found in his *Reflections*. That work, on which his popular fame chiefly rests, does not fairly represent his genius. It was written in a style calculated to produce a great immediate effect, and was in this respect eminently successful. It would probably have been

less effective if it had been more original and more profound. In these qualities Burke's subsequent writings are greatly superior to it.

Mr. Macknight, who is himself chiefly known as a pamphleteer, has given most prominence to Burke's political writings, and has scarcely done justice to his most remarkable literary production, the *Abridgment of English History*. The most learned of all the writers on the same subject, Lappenberg, says, speaking of this book, that if Burke had devoted himself continuously to historical pursuits, England might have possessed a history worthy to rank with the masterpieces of the Attic and the Tuscan historians. If we may believe the story that Burke desisted from the undertaking because Hume had taken up the same subject, it must ever be regretted that the reverse did not occur, and that the philosopher did not give way to the politician. We should certainly have had a much better History of England; for there is very little doubt that as Burke was our greatest statesman, so he would have been the first of our historians. In that part of the work which he completed, he speaks of mediæval institutions with an intelligence and appreciation which in his time were almost equally rare among Catholics, Protestants, and infidels. The great ecclesiastical writers of the preceding age, such as Bossuet and Fleury, had about as little sympathy with the middle ages as Mosheim or Voltaire. Leibniz alone had written about them in a tone which would not now be contemptible. The vast compilations of great scholars, of Dugange, Mabillon and Muratori, had not yet borne fruit on the Continent; and in England the rise of a better school of historians was still more remote. Several generations of men were still to follow, who were to derive their knowledge of the middle ages from the Introduction to Robertson's *Charles V.*, to study ecclesiastical history in the pages of Gibbon, and to admire Hume as the prince of historians. At the age of thirty, Burke proved himself superior to that system of prejudice and ignorance which was then universal, and which is not yet completely dissipated. Mr. Macknight's remarks on the book, though not quite just, are sufficiently characteristic of himself to deserve being quoted:

“ Though scarcely a history, this work is excellent as a disquisition. Written in 1757, it has none of that illiberal liberality which was then so much in fashion. The services of the Catholic Church, and even of the monastic system, to the cause of civilisation in the dark ages, are fully admitted. There is no sneering at the monks, no bewailing the superstitions and prejudices of the people, no raptures at the lights of the eighteenth century.”

It is remarkable that so many of our public men should have written history. Our historians are more often great historical actors than great historical writers. Their works are generally remarkable for every quality excepting learning. It is characteristic of the English mind that we should so long have been without regular learned histories. In the most essential qualities our professional historians cannot compete with those of other countries; and we have nobody who will bear a comparison with Niebuhr, or Hurter, or Ranke, any more than with Thucydides or Tacitus. Gibbon, Lingard, Grote are not equal to the moderns in learning: Hume and Macaulay are inferior in art to the ancients. In the middle ages great deeds were performed by men who could not write; and they were recorded by men who had not seen, and could not understand, them. Many of the greatest historians of the present day write from the seclusion of their libraries concerning events of which they have no experience. But the prevailing character of the English historians has been neither that of the monastic chronicler nor of the German professor. The catalogue is crowded with names distinguished in another sphere,—Bacon, Raleigh, Milton, Clarendon, Burnet, Swift, Fox, and Mackintosh. This connection between historical studies and political life has been more beneficial in developing the qualities of the statesman than of the historian. Our historical literature was long in emancipating itself from the traditional falsehoods which are so dear to the popular mind, and consequently such studies have not yet exercised that powerful influence for good which is so conspicuous abroad. But Burke was free both from vulgar prejudice and from pedantry; and no other man was so well fitted to adorn history with the attainments of a great scholar, and the reality and vigour derived from personal experience of public affairs.

Mr. Macknight deserves great credit for having traced the growth of Burke's ideas respecting the Catholic religion, and for pointing out all the causes which contributed to produce those enlightened views by which he was so remarkably distinguished. After tracing his obscure ancestry, he says:

“Burke certainly never forgot that his forefathers had been Catholics. He never forgot that their religion was proscribed in the country he so much loved. Though himself by education and by conviction a sincere member of the Church of England, he ever respected the creed of the mother who had cherished him in his helpless infancy, of Mrs. Crotty the nurse who had borne him in her arms, and of his uncle Garret, whom he believed to be the best and kindest of human beings. So powerful an influence had this

association on his whole life, that, unless it is steadily borne in mind, much of his history and political career must be quite unintelligible."

Burke's mother was a Catholic, and he seems to have continued extremely attached to her even during the time of his estrangement from his father. When a boy, he was much with his Catholic uncles. Besides these early influences, the same generous hatred of oppression which afterwards displayed itself on another field in the impeachment of Hastings seems to have incited in him a warm sympathy with the oppressed Irish; and in his last years there is no doubt that his familiarity with many of the exiled clergy of France operated in the same manner. Many absurd stories have been circulated to account for the favour with which he treated Catholics. In his time the Duke of Newcastle suspected him of being a Catholic; and we learn from a notice of Mr. Macknight's book in a well-known weekly contemporary, that there are still persons foolish enough to believe it. Dr. Nugent, Burke's father-in-law, was a Catholic; and the same has often been said of Mrs. Burke herself. The evidence which makes Mr. Macknight think this not improbable is exceedingly weak. All these reports originate only in the necessity of accounting for the absence of intolerance in Burke, which is to many people still incomprehensible. There is, however, no reason to suppose that he would have been prepossessed in favour of the Church by one who did not bring up her children in her own faith, and who certainly did not habitually fulfil her religious duties. There is no reason to doubt that Mrs. Burke was a Presbyterian, like her mother. In fact, there was much that was essentially Catholic in Burke's mind, and which appears quite as distinctly in his general political views as in his conduct towards the Catholics. We will make room for one more passage on this point:

"As the first of Burke's efforts against oppression, his wishes, thoughts, and intentions at this time (1763) in favour of the Catholics have been far too little understood. In his old age he appealed to those who knew what his sentiments were while he was in Ireland, during Lord Halifax's administration, and declared that they had not in any manner been changed, but were then just as much matured in his mind as at any later period. There were then no Catholic associations, no Catholic agitators, no politicians in England prepared to temporise with Catholic Emancipation. Grattan was yet a schoolboy. William Pitt was a mere child. Charles Fox was at Eton, and writing French verses in praise of Lord Bute. Canning was not yet born. Holland House, instead of being the citadel of liberalism, was the noisome receptacle of political corruption.

To the great man whose life and works are the subject of these pages, is due the honour of having, in season and out of season, continued the warfare with more consistency, ardour, and perseverance, than any other statesman of his time, or of the succeeding generation. We have seen that this fragment on the penal laws, his first work on practical politics, was in favour of his oppressed countrymen. We shall see that the last letter he dictated on political affairs, reclining on a couch, with his strength exhausted, with his last hour fast approaching, and in hasty intervals during the cessation of pain, had the same sacred object."

Mr. Macknight's two volumes, however, do not come down so far. They stop in 1783. Hitherto Burke is a brilliant partisan, a popular leader in a popular cause. The task of his Whig biographer has been comparatively easy. The most interesting, but far the most difficult, portion of his life remains, in which from the leader of a party he became a teacher of mankind. The writings of these latter years cannot be judged by the narrow standard of party politics; and his biographer, in order to be equal to his great argument, will need to put aside all party views, and to recognise the universal principles of political philosophy which Burke so eloquently upheld at the close of his life, and which led to the secession of 1791.

SUNNY MEMORIES OF ROME.

Recollections of the Four Last Popes, and of Rome in their Times. By his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. London, 1858: Hurst and Blackett.

WE regret that this book came into our hands too late to allow us to give it the notice which the author and the subject alike seem to require. We must therefore leave to others the task of reviewing it as it deserves, and must content ourselves with calling the attention of our readers to a few of the points which more particularly interested us in our hasty perusal. The foremost of these is the personal attachment which the Cardinal exhibits towards the Holy See and the city of the Popes. This personal attachment he considers to be the characteristic distinction of Ultramontanism. "What in reality is Ultramontanism?" he asks. "Not certainly a variation of doctrine, but a more vivid and individual perception, an experience, of its operation. The 'supremacy'

is believed by the untravelled as much as by the travelled Catholic. But facilities of access, and many other reasons, have increased the number of those who have come into contact with successive pontiffs; and this has seldom failed to ripen an abstract belief into an affectionate sentiment. But with those who have continued for years under the same influence, unvarying in its winning and impressive forms, it becomes a fixed element, constant and persevering where all else may differ, and gives a warmth and strength to their religious and ecclesiastical convictions." This passage perhaps gives the key-note of the whole book: it is a work not so much of the critical faculties as of the affections and sentiments, which reject all painful impressions, and bask only in sunny memories. Indeed, the Cardinal says in his preface, that narratives exhibiting the darker side of the picture would have been impossible to him. "He does not retain in his memory histories of startling wickedness, nor pictures of peculiar degradation. He has seen much of the people . . . and he could tell about them just as many edifying anecdotes as tales of crime or woe. And as to wicked persons, it certainly was the providence of his early life not to be thrown into the society of the bad. He can add with sincerity that later he has not sought it. . . His looks were towards the virtuous; . . . of others he cannot speak. . . Let the work, then, be taken for what it is." Such a scope as this takes the Cardinal's book out of the sphere of history; and though he invites the future historian to give it a place among his materials, he knows that by itself the personal and affectionate recollections of individual virtues do not constitute history. "Every where," says a famous writer, "foolish rumour babbles not of what was done, but of what was misdone or undone; and foolish history—ever more or less the written epitomised synopsis of rumour—knows so little that were not as well unknown: Attila invasions, Walter-the-Penniless crusades, Sicilian Vespers, Thirty-years Wars,—mere sin and misery—not work, but hindrance of work." Mere virtue and goodness, if they do not make annals empty, make them at least boring to the common reader; hence Montesquieu exclaims, "Happy the people whose annals are tiresome;" an axiom which a paradoxical philosopher has developed into, "Happy the people whose annals are vacant." But as there are other things in the moral world beside "mere sin and misery," so there are departments in the world of letters other than historical. Poetry is as real a food of the mind as history—more real than statistics. The absent lover does not consider the enumeration of his mistress's freckles necessary to the comple-

tion of her ideal portrait. The sensitiveness of friendship would soon wither in the presence of a critical catalogue of all the faults and littlenesses of one's friend. The sentiments and affections require the idealisation of their object. They will scarcely survive without it. Love and ardent friendship always imagine in the creature more than they find in it. This investiture of the beloved object with tints borrowed from our own heart and imagination is a natural privilege of man; and we have just as much right to turn it to a religious as to a natural account. It is not the foundation of our religion. The Cardinal truly says, that every Catholic believes the supremacy—believes it on argumentative grounds; but not every Catholic erects it into an ideal object of his enthusiasm and attachment. Yet surely there is no more absurdity in doing so, than in erecting any mere creature into such an object. On the contrary, the more surely the doctrine of the supremacy is founded in reason and revelation, the more it becomes, if not our duty, at least our gain and our happiness, to look at it from the same point of the view as the Cardinal takes his stand upon.

In this volume, then, the Cardinal lets himself be seen chewing the cud of memory; recalling from their deep store-houses the images of men whom he had known and revered; revolving into periods the little conversations he has had with them; and affectionately reproducing the circumstances of time and place that connected him with them. When an author has determined on thus imparting to the public the scaffolding of his building, and on letting his readers see the whole development and elaboration of his recollections, the result is naturally some such as the book before us, where perhaps the events receive more colour and magnitude from their personal aspect, and their suggestiveness to the author, than from any intrinsic importance which recommends them to the reader on their own account. Such a book of recollections might of course be characterised by any temper. This book is characterised by the most unvarying good-humour and benevolence. The writer is in the best of tempers with every body. His recollections are too bright to admit of shade. He looks through the glasses of philanthropy, and all things that come within the field of his vision partake of the same tint. Our readers will perhaps remember how Gibbon, loth to have the flow of his panegyric of Roman policy interrupted by the awkward narrative of St. Cyprian's martyrdom, and yet unable to be silent on such an event, conducts the saint to the block with most delicate respect and sympathetic politeness, spares his feelings, gives his disgrace the air of a triumph,

and chops his head off with unfeigned regret, in obedience to the dictates of a stern political necessity. Some such feeling has prevented the Cardinal from marring his canvas with too dark touches, even when he paints the characters of the persecutors of Pius VII. In no case is this more remarkable than in that of Napoleon I. We have no wish to deny the merits of that extraordinary man. As human nature goes, he is as good a founder of empire and dynasty as Cæsar, Clovis, or William the Conqueror. His concordat, modelled upon that made by Cardinal Pole for England, was one of the most important and beneficial instruments ever made in the interest of the Church. But the man himself! We are afraid that even the Cardinal's eloquence, backed, as doubtless it will be, by the 'imprimatur' of the *Moniteur*, will scarcely persuade the reader to believe all that is said about him. We may admit that he was "eagle in his soar, eagle in his strength of wing when balanced above his aim, and in swiftness when darting on it, eagle in his gripe; yet eagle in all that distinguishes the king of birds from vulture, hawk, or gentle falcon;" but with historical scandal in our memories, we can scarcely subscribe to his "fitting a throne as if he had been nursed upon it, surrounding it with the splendour of feudal monarchies, and filling it with the grace of ancient kings;" nor can we say that to us "he seemed to have learned intuitively the tastes, the tact, the amenities, and still more the duties and exigencies, of an imperial royalty." Perhaps the fairest estimate of his character would be in some middle term between the Cardinal's panegyric and the following brilliant and caustic invective of the American lecturer:

"He was singularly destitute of generous sentiments. He had not the merit of common truth and honesty. He was unjust to his generals, egotistic and monopolising. He was a boundless liar. His *Moniteurs* were proverbs of mendaciousness. In his premature old age he sat in his lonely island coldly falsifying facts and dates and characters, to give to his history a theatrical *éclat*. He only wished to make a great noise. He loved nobody. He was thoroughly unscrupulous. He would steal, slander, assassinate, drown, and poison, as his interest dictated. He had no generosity, but mere vulgar hatred. He was intensely selfish. He was perfidious. He cheated at cards. He was a prodigious gossip, and opened letters, and delighted in his infamous police, and rubbed his hands with joy when he had intercepted some morsel of intelligence concerning the men and women about him, boasting that he 'knew every thing;' and interfered with the cutting of the dresses of the women; and listened after the hurrahs and the compliments of the street *incognito*. His manners were coarse. He treated women

with low familiarity. He had the habit of pulling their ears, and pinching their cheeks [and toes] when he was in good-humour, and of pulling the ears and whiskers of men, and of striking, and of horse-play with them, to his last days. It does not appear that he listened at keyholes, or, at least, that he was caught at it. In short, when you had penetrated through all the circle of power and splendour, you were not dealing with a gentleman at last, but with an impostor and a rogue; and he fully deserved the epithet of *Jupiter Scapin*, or a sort of scamp Jupiter.”*

We must not, however, leave our readers under the impression that the Cardinal preserves the tone which we have indicated in all parts of his book. In many passages, especially those which relate to English matters, we have excellent historical judgments and critical corrections of mistaken opinions. We will select as a specimen the following brief account of Bishop Baines :

“ By degrees the reputation which he had acquired in England began to spread in Rome ; several noble families in which he had been intimate at home were in Rome, and gave many others the opportunity of becoming acquainted with him ; and he had a power of fascinating all who approached him, in spite of a positive tone and manner which scarcely admitted of difference from him in opinion. He had sometimes original views upon a certain class of subjects ; but on every topic he had a command of language, and a clear manner of expressing his sentiments which commanded attention, and generally won assent. Hence his acquaintances were always willing listeners, and soon became sincere admirers, then warm partisans. Unfortunately this proved to him a fatal gift. When he undertook great and even magnificent works, he would stand alone ; assent to his plans was the condition of being near him ; any one that did not agree, or that ventured to suggest deliberation or provoke discussion, was soon at a distance ; he isolated himself with his own genius, he had no counsellor but himself ; and he who had at one time surrounded himself with men of learning, of prudence, and of devotedness to him, found himself at last alone, and fretted a noble heart to a solitary death.

At the period, however, to which this chapter belongs (Leo XII.) these faults could scarcely show themselves to any great disparagement of his higher and better powers. In the course of the winter he was able to appear in the English pulpit. The church, which was nearly empty when preachers of inferior mark occupied it, was crowded when Bishop Baines was announced as the orator. Many people will remember him. He was happiest in his unwritten discourses. The flow of his words was easy and copious, his imagery was often very elegant, and his discourses were replete with thought and solid matter. But his great power was in his delivery, in voice,

* Emerson's Representative Men.

in tone, in look, in gesture. His whole manner was full of pathos, sometimes even more than the matter justified; there was a peculiar tremulousness of voice, which gave his words more than double effect, notwithstanding a broadness of provincial accent, and an occasional dramatic pronunciation of certain words. In spite of such defects, he was considered by all that heard him one of the most eloquent and earnest preachers they had ever attended. Such was the person destined in the mind of Leo to be the first English cardinal."

To us this is a very suggestive sketch. History teaches us that it is not only princes like Nero and Arcadius that surround themselves with a court that draws down the contempt of men. Courtiers, to deserve such a judgment, need not be the fiddlers, stage-players, coachmen, buffoons, and cooks who infested Nero's palace; neither need the prince himself be a man of the same stamp as that monster. He may be a genius, he may have an abundance of estimable qualities; yet in spite of all, he may have the unhappy knack of driving from his presence all men of sense, and of surrounding himself with a coterie of persons who reflect any thing but light upon him. It is not only weak and wicked rulers who can never have the benefit of a wise council; some strong and good men place themselves in the same unhappy state. Men who cannot endure criticism, or bear the suspicion of a rival intellect; who refuse to share honour and credit, and envy all that threatens to outtop them; persons who strive to shine in all departments, to understand every thing at once, to be oracles on all subjects, and to hear all their performances praised as perfect in their kind: or again, men who do all for themselves, and will not brook advice, and therefore hate talking on serious matters, and can only put up with jocular or facetious, or flattering or fawning talk,—they may give up hours to working in private, but will not listen to business in company; or they wish affairs to be conducted on free-and-easy principles, on the foundation of kindness or civility, or disregard of detail; they will promise without any fixed intention of performance; they will treat with studied neglect, or even hostility, those who take an independent line. They will often take more pride in their accidental performances than in the fulfilment of their duties. Of such men are made kings whose excellence is in being philosophers, or poets, or musicians, or painters; and statesmen who are great writers of novels, or satirists, or reviewers. Such persons, by a stern necessity of nature, are incapacitated from surrounding themselves with useful advisers; their court is unworthy of them. And yet the chief power of man is to use his fellow-creatures; to draw them

out, to set them to work, to apportion their tasks, to direct and control without interfering with their independence, to put the right man into the right place, to attract to himself talent of all kinds, and to reign, not because he is superior to each in his own department, but because all feel that he has that highest of human faculties, the power of directing men. This is, or should be, the characteristic of a ruler: no individual arm can reach far; no mind can comprehend all things. He is far-reaching who can command other men's arms; he comprehends most who has most minds at his service. Lamennais was describing to the Cardinal the ways in which prejudices had to be overcome, and public opinion won over. He was asked:

“ ‘But what or where are the instruments with which such difficult and great things have to be wrought?’ ‘They do not exist as yet,’ he answered; ‘you must begin, then, by making the implements; it is what we are doing in France.’ And glorious indeed were the weapons that came from that armory. Montalembert, Rio, Cœur, Lacordaire, Comballot, and many others.”

To form and to use human instruments is the proper province of a ruler. If he cannot do this, he fails in his own line. He may be a good father, or a good painter, but not a good king; for, after all, the chief excellence of a man is to do his own work well. We do not call a man a good tailor because he can play at cricket, nor a good ruler because he is an eloquent orator; any more than nowadays we should agree with old Chaucer when he describes his physician:

“ In all this world there was not one him like
To speak of physic and of surgery,
For he was grounded in astronomy.”

This, we are afraid, was the case with Bishop Baines; he was a good bishop, because he was popular in the Bath pump-room. He could not use, he could not even agree with, other men. He was solitary, self-dependent, and therefore dependent on unworthy admirers. From refusing to take advice from Catholics, he at last came to truckle to Protestants; and we know a case that happened at Westbury in Wiltshire, where the Bishop had intimate friends, which proves to what strange eccentricities solitary and absolute thoughts can conduct the mind of even a good Catholic. A poor girl applied to him for instruction in religion; and she was actually referred by him to Mr. Cook, the Protestant vicar of the place!

This is the prelate of whom Dr. Oliver tells us that “he had considerable tact, winning address, and easy eloquence;

but perhaps he was inferior to his predecessors of the Western Vicariate in accuracy of mind and gravity of judgment, especially in financial matters. Constitutional infirmity may have contributed to render him more excitable and irresolute; be this as it may, his name will ever rank amongst the luminaries of our English Catholic Church."

In the same chapter from which we have extracted the account of Bishop Baines, the Cardinal refutes the report that Dr. Lingard was elevated to the purple, and reserved *in petto* by Leo XII. The arguments seem to us solid and conclusive, though they are too long to extract. The person thus reserved was, in the Cardinal's opinion, not Lingard, but Lamennais. In view of this disposition to criticise Englishmen and English affairs, the families of Cardinal Weld and Cardinal Acton may well be gratified with the handsome notices which are given of those illustrious persons.

The Cardinal's Roman reminiscences range from 1818 to 1842. The personal recollections of the college student cannot be expected to approach very near the throne; accordingly, those referring to Pius VII. are eked out and amplified with much detail that does not seem to come precisely within the scope of the work. As time proceeds, and the student becomes a dignitary, a scholar, and a writer, he is called into closer connection with the reigning Popes, and his recollections are more varied and numerous. Our readers know that the materials of the volume were at first delivered in the form of lectures. We think we can detect several passages which still stand as they were then delivered, and which have been copied from the short-hand writer's notes without receiving the revision which we could have wished for them. But such trifles cannot with good grace be objected against an author who has almost to steal time from overwhelming business for the amenities of literature. The volume is well printed, well got up, and well illustrated. The portraits of Pius VII. and of Gregory XVI. are especially excellent.

CUDDESDON CASUISTRY.

Correspondence relating to Cuddesdon Theological College, in answer to the Charges of the Rev. C. P. Golightly. Oxford, Vincent. ^s

IN the *Quarterly Review* of January 1858 certain charges were brought against the above college, which were extracted and

printed by the Rev. C. P. Golightly, in a letter addressed to "the clergy and laity of the diocese of Oxford." The allegations were,—1. That the chapel of the college is "fitted up with every fantastic decoration to which a party meaning has been assigned." 2. That the so-called altar "affects in every particular the closest approximation to the Romish model." 3. That the service of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is "conducted with genuflexions, rinsings of cups in the piscina, and other ceremonial acts, foreign to the ritual and usages of the Church of England." 4. And lastly, that a service-book is in use in the chapel "concocted from the Seven Canonical Hours of the Romish Church."

In consequence of this accusation, the diocesan addressed a letter to the principal of the college, in which, after stating that his "excellent but not very judicious friend Mr. Golightly, having had his feelings excited, has thought it his duty to publish an inflammatory letter," his lordship requests a distinct reply to each article of the accusation. Accordingly the principal reports that,—1. The chapel of the college is fitted up with no fantastic decorations. 2. The "so-called altar," so far from "affecting to approximate to the Roman model," is a simple wooden table—movable—covered with an ordinary red covering during all the year, except Advent and Lent, when darker coverings are used; and at the time of celebrations with a fair white linen cloth, without lace or other ornament. The table stands on a very slight chancel elevation above the chapel level. 3. In the Communion Service the only "genuflexions" are the kneeling down of the clergy when they pray. The only "rinsings," that for convenience the vessels are washed before they are put away, but not in the face of the congregation. There are no "ceremonial acts foreign to the usage of the English Church." The clergyman stands in the usual place, and uses the usual forms, and no others. 4. Besides the ordinary services, there are other short services, wherein are some prayers "drawn from the same quarters as those from which the Prayer-Book was compiled;" where, however, "the keenest eye can detect no traces of Romish error." Finally, the principal begs the bishop to depute the three archdeacons of the diocese to examine the matters. They are so deputed, and their report on the whole confirms the principal's statement: though they complain of too much gilding and painting on the walls and roof, and of the hangings at the east end; and also of the unfortunate resemblance of the book of devotions to the Breviary; yet they own that it does not contain or suggest any doctrine at variance with that of the Church of Eng-

land, and they suggest certain alterations which will destroy this objection.

On receiving this report, the bishop writes to the principal, rejoicing that it "negatives completely every charge brought against him by his gossiping friend Mr. Golightly," and concluding with these words: "I do not expect you to satisfy Mr. Golightly; the habits of his mind make him unable to form an unbiased judgment on any matter which appeals to his inveterate prejudices. I doubt whether any diocesan college could satisfy him; I am sure that none could which simply embodied in its conduct the full practice and teaching of the Church of England."

Of course we have no sympathy whatever with a college whose teachers boast that they succeed in attaching waverers to the Church of England, and that their lectures furnish the pupils "with the soundest and most conclusive arguments against Roman error." But still in their controversy with Mr. Golightly we take their side; we remember when irreverent undergraduates used to call that reverend gentleman "Paul Pry;" we have heard how he has been found in men's rooms, examining their books in their absence, and making a catalogue of suspicious prints or pieces of furniture for the edification of provosts and principals. Twenty years seem to have made no alteration in his nature; white hairs have brought neither wisdom, nor discretion, nor honour. We cannot therefore join with those who extol him as an honourable adversary, who give him credit for fairness and straightforwardness, and accuse on his testimony the poor Cuddesdon people of all kinds of knavery and dissimulation. These men really are opposed to "Rome;" they are therefore real heretics; and if we blame them, it should be for being so, not for saying they are so. They believe in a kind of Eucharistic sacrifice, but not in the sacrifice of the Mass; why, then, need they incur the odium of being thought herein to approximate to Rome? why should we call it cowardly in them to refuse to suffer in defence of a dogma which they do not believe?

But it is said, their answers to Mr. Golightly's accusations are notoriously cowardly, insincere, and untruthful. We do not at all admit this. Examine the answers in detail, and you will find them strictly true. The only thing which one can say of them is, that they show considerable acuteness in answering a fool according to his folly, and prove that the Cuddesdon students have learned well the lesson of Hesiod's line:

νήπιοι, οὐδ' ἴσασιν ὅσῳ πλέον ἤμισυ παντός.

No fools, for they know how much better it is to tell half

the truth than all. When they deny that the chapel of the college is "fitted up with any fantastic decoration," you should consider carefully what each word means before you accuse the writer of telling a lie. The archdeacons find "that the chapel is very highly adorned with painting and gilding on the walls and roof, and with hangings at the east end;" but they "see no reason for imputing a party meaning to these decorations,"—the "fantastic fittings" are clearly paintings on the walls and beams. Now we submit that fittings are furniture of some kind; no mere colouring can be called by such name: our American friends might call them "fixings," but clearly in English they are not "fittings." Again, there is a question what *fantastic* means. It may imply an image speaking through the fancy to the intellect; or it may imply, in Mr. Golightly's meaning, a mere senseless sign, adopted without rhyme or reason as the badge of a party. Of such kind doubtless he supposes the cross, the Agnus Dei, the pelican, and other well-known symbols, to be; but the Cuddesdon people would think it shocking to call such symbols "fantastic." Therefore, if Mr. Golightly, having beheld these pictures on the wall, chooses to cry out Nehushtan, and to demand the erasure of the "fantastic decorations," the Cuddesdon people have no other course than to deny that such things exist. A fool must be answered according to his folly. Puseyites cannot be expected to own that symbols which they hold sacred are fantastic, merely because Mr. Golightly chooses to call them so.

Then about the "so-called altar," they only adopt Mr. Golightly's words. They know that though they hold it to be an altar, yet their right to call it so is very doubtful, existing only on sufferance; the "so-called altar" of the Church of England, so far from "affecting to approximate to the Roman model," must be simply a wooden table. Since the stone-altar decision, they have no right to have it otherwise; it must, moreover, be "movable;" only we remember a clergyman putting up in his church a massive oak-table weighing about a ton. When the archdeacon inquired whether it was movable, the clergyman replied, "O dear yes; you may move it if you like; it is not fixed:" neither was it, except by its weight, which fastened it more securely than nails or rivets. But through this mist of denials two questions occur to us. The "so-called altar" is a movable wooden table; but do they not call it and treat it as an altar? or if not, is there any thing behind which they consider a real altar?—any portable stone with five crosses on it which they slip under the "fair linen cloth without lace" while they are celebrating

their Supper? We do not say there is, only in reading the reply it struck us there might be.

Their answers about the conduct of the Communion Service are quite triumphant. "The only genuflexions are the kneeling down of the clergy when they pray." Capital! poor benighted Papists are supposed by Mr. Golightly to cross themselves and kneel without any notion of prayer, as a wizard makes a mesmeric pass, or waves his magic wand. Mr. Golightly supposed the same "mummery" was practised at Cuddesdon. The reply is, not a denial that genuflexions are made, but an affirmation that they are accompanied with prayer. We are afraid that poor Mr. Golightly has no chance against such adroit pursuers of the wrong scent. Again, "the only rinsings are, that for convenience the vessels are washed before they are put away, but not in the face of the congregation." Well said i'faith—for convenience! It is good, yea, indeed it is; good phrases are surely, and ever were, very commendable: *convenience*—*convenance*; it comes from *convenientia*, and signifies that which is proper, fit, or agreeable to the nature of a thing. If the Supper is not a sham, it is very convenient, fitting, and proper that the vessels should be rinsed by the clergy before they are put away;—"but not in the face of the congregation." No surely, to turn round and make a ceremony of washing the vessels while all the congregation was looking on, would be a curious preface to the greater solemnity which is to be introduced into the Establishment. The act, we have no doubt, is very carefully veiled from too prying eyes. Mr. Golightly himself would have been ignorant of it had he not been enlightened by the brilliant *Quarterly*. Again, "there are no ceremonial acts foreign to the usage of the English Church. The clergyman stands in the usual place, and uses the usual forms, and no others." Here, again, Mr. Golightly is very properly answered: the clergyman stands in the usual place, that is, we presume, usual at Cuddesdon and other Puseyite places of worship, before the table, not at its side, and uses the usual forms,—that is, those external acts and gestures which he does use. No doubt; but we have known clergymen who have inserted prayers from the Missal between the declamations of the Anglican service, and have in that way filled up the lamentable gaps there occurring. Such supplementary prayers are not *ceremonial acts*; but they are exactly the things which we suppose Mr. Golightly intended to impute to the Cuddesdon clergy, and these are not mentioned in the reply. Crooked questions provoke crooked answers. If you have passed a man in the street, and he afterwards asks you what fool that

was that passed him at such a time, you naturally deny that there was any fool, otherwise you would indirectly confess yourself such a person. Mr. Golightly's questions could not be answered according to his meaning without implicitly conceding the validity of his objections and the truth of his views. The Cuddesdon people therefore wisely answer his grammatical words, and succeed in giving no answer at all to the question really at issue. We congratulate them on the progress they are evidently making in the theory of equivocation and suppression of truth.

At the end of the pamphlet is an appendix containing those prayers used at the college which are "accused of a Romish tendency;" one of these, from "a modern original source," strikes us as so peculiarly un-Roman, that we must transcribe it for our readers' edification, in order to let them see what sort of prayers our adversaries think we use:

"Almighty God, we beseech Thee to hear our prayers for all such as sin against Thee, or neglect to serve Thee [especially N.]; that Thou wouldest bestow upon them true contrition," &c.

Fancy praying with a loud voice in church for all publicans and sinners, especially Smith! What a nice set of Pharisees Cuddesdon must turn out! And this is "accused of a Romish tendency!" Truly we cannot see any thing Romish about it, nor imagine a possible parallel, except perhaps a fervent daughter recommending a tepid mother to the pious prayers of an archconfraternity.

Short Notices.

THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, &c.

Semi-Protestantism: a Few Remarks on the Second Pastoral Letter, and other Publications, of the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. By Richard Ward, Catholic Missioner at Frome. (Bristol, Austin and Oates; London, Burns and Lambert.) The ability and calm strength of this pamphlet make us hope to see the writer exercise his pen on larger subjects, or rather on larger divisions of the same subject. His charity and conciliatory tone eminently fit him for controversy, while his clearness and force are much more incisive than any amount of words steeped in vinegar and gall. The application of much of the pamphlet is personal to Mr. Bennett, and certain of his late publications; but in the conclusion the writer generalises his observations, and erects his antagonist into the representative of a school to which he gives the name of semi-Protestantism, and against which he argues in a masterly way. The following

extracts are given to show what this conclusion is, rather than to give a specimen of the literary merits of the pamphlet, from which other passages might have been selected with more effect. Those that we give explain what the writer means by "Semi-Protestantism."

"The Jews believed the Scriptures; but did not believe in our Lord Jesus Christ. Having come, therefore, to be their Light, He bids them 'search the Scriptures;' that from the Scriptures, which bear testimony of Him, they may learn to know and follow Him. Protestants are so far like the Jews, that they believe the Scriptures, but do not believe that our Lord continues, through the medium of the Church, to afford mankind a living and visible rule of faith. And the Church, availing herself of their belief in the Scriptures, might say to them, in the spirit of our Lord's admonition to the Jews: 'Search the Scriptures; for ye expect to find in them the religion of Christ, and they bear witness, that as He was sent by the Father, so have I been sent by Him, to teach His religion to mankind.' But here the resemblance ceases. For in reply to our blessed Lord the Jews did not say,—at least there is no record of their having said,—'We search the Scriptures; but whether they give testimony of Thee we care not to inquire. Thine own admonition proves that the Scriptures, and not Christ, must be our Light.' And here, at the point where the Jews differ from Protestants, their resemblance to Mr. Bennett begins. They deny not that Christ, when He comes, shall be their Light. Nor does Mr. Bennett deny that the decision of the universal Church, 'when it may be had,' shall be the rule of his faith. But they say that He who stands before them is not the Christ. And Mr. Bennett protests, that the unity of the Church is not visible now, and that, until it appears, her decision cannot be had. And this semi-protest destroys the principle of authority, which he professes to uphold, quite as effectually as if he denied it in express terms. It substitutes 'seeking' and 'waiting' for 'following' and 'obeying' quite as perniciously as the principle of private judgment. Rather, it is that principle in a very flimsy disguise; and the mock homage which it pays to the authority of the Church is a symbol of the monstrous illusions which it has in store for its dupes.

"For how stands the case? Mr. Bennett delivers two messages to his parishioners: one to this effect,—that the universal Church possesses by divine appointment a spiritual authority to which their understandings must surrender and submit; the other to this,—that the same universal Church has been for centuries, and still is, 'a house divided against itself.' Now, since 'no man can serve two masters,' this latter message, from which they learn that the Church's authority has been rent asunder, and is now 'divided against itself,' seems to mock, defeat, and annul the former, which teaches them the spirit of subjection. Most reasonable therefore it is, and most necessary, that they should ask him whether these two messages are equally authentic; whether he has received them himself from one and the same source; and whether they are delivered by him with the same sanctions. As to the former, which proclaims the Church's authority, this we know to be part and parcel of his creed. It comes, as he believes, from Christ Himself; and has been handed down from age to age, having the blood of martyrs, and their miracles, for its seal. But the other message, which seems to contradict it; what account has he to give of that? From whose lips has he been taught that the 'one faith' (and therefore that authority which is the correlative of faith) has to be gathered piecemeal from the variations of a divided body? He dare not assert that this too is a revealed truth, a dogma for which he would be bound to lay down his life. It is, he must

admit, but an opinion of his own. A mere opinion; springing out of his own view of the present state of Christendom, and supported by his private interpretation of Holy Scripture and Church History. An improbable opinion; involving impalpable absurdities, and based on the gratuitous assumption that the Anglo-Saxon communion is a constituent part of a dispersed society which *nowhere*, on the face of the whole earth, bestows on it the faintest semblance of recognition.

“Authority says: There is one Church, whose decisions are secured from error by the promises made to its visible head: therefore to this head every member of the Church, without exception, must in matters of faith surrender his own mind. Private judgment says: Let every man be his own Pope. But this is more easily said than done. Some men have an aptitude for being duped; others for being persuaded; others for being awed. Then the semi-Protestant minister steps in, and addresses his parishioners to this effect: ‘Let us divide these two principles between us. You take the duty of submission, and act upon it by obeying my voice. I will represent the principle of private judgment by withholding my own submission from every living soul. Thus you will have the merit of obedience; and that merit will be increased by the perception that your obedience is rendered to a fallible, and denied to an infallible Pope.’”

We sincerely hope that the sale of his little book may encourage our somewhat shy author to trust himself and his pen to longer and more frequent labours.

Popular Objections to Catholic Faith and Practice considered. By Wm. Dodsworth, M.A. (London, Burns and Lambert.) Mr. Dodsworth is an earnest and thoughtful man, and his matter is always good and sensible; but we think the title of this pamphlet gives a false impression. Popular objections require a popular reply; he who professes to answer them, professes to do so *ad populum*, to write down to the level of the objectors. We have tested this production, and it has failed. A person was sent to us for instruction, and as she was going we looked for a book to lend her: Mr. Dodsworth’s new pamphlet was lying on our table; the title promised just the things we were looking for; we took it up, but before lending it we glanced at a page or two. The first sentence on which our eye rested was this: “If the Church be asked for, no ‘abnormal condition,’ no ‘abeyance’ or ‘dormancy’ of gifts for fourteen or fifteen centuries, no tampering with the plain words of our Lord’s promise, is indicated in her reply. There is no requirement of the ‘tale of bricks with a refusal of the straw,’” &c. We read out the sentence; but of course our patient was hopelessly mystified. If the objections discussed are “popular,” the manner of discussing them is eminently the reverse,—a misty generalised vocabulary, and a syntax not always correct, produce a result quite opposite to the clear incisive style necessary to the popular controversialist. For such a purpose it is better to be shallow than deep and dark. Above all things, pellucid language is requisite. But Mr. Dodsworth has not studied this gift. We must record our opinion, that one reason why our controversies are so little read is because we cannot or do not write for the people. We may sneer at Milner, or Robert Manning, or Father Parsons; but we question whether any of our present writers addresses the popular mind with equal effect. We really do not know of *any* modern tracts which speak the language of the people—which prove their authors to have the “art of easy writing what should be easy reading,” and to take pains not to

“Confound the language of the nation
With long-tailed words in *osity* and *ation*.”

To complete the picture of the Church in India which we gave in December last, we reprint the following tabular statement of the Catholic statistics of India from the *Madras Catholic Directory for 1858*.

Vicariates.	Bishops.	Priests.	Catholic Population.
Madras	1	18	44,720
Hyderabad	1	9	5,240
Vizagapatam	1	18	7,130
Pondicherry	1	53	100,046
Mysore	1	16	17,277
Coimbatore	1	11	17,200
Madura	1	42	110,000
Quilon	1	16	44,200
Verapoly	1	439	228,006
Mangalore	1	24	40,480
Bombay	1	33	17,100
Agra	1	25	20,000
Patna	1	10	3,400
Western Bengal	1	12	15,000
Eastern Bengal	1	6	8,000
Ava and Pegu	1	11	5,320
Malayan Peninsula	1	23	5,830
Siam	1	12	4,900
Jaffna	1	17	60,000
Colombo	1	18	80,900
	20	813	864,349

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

One of the writers in the *Rambler*, who is engaged on a *Life of Father Campion*, begs to inquire through its pages, whether any of its readers can give him information about some books which probably contain valuable information concerning the martyr. One is a *Concio apologetica contra Ed. Campianum*, preached at Oxford by a quondam friend of his, Tobie Mathew, and published there in 1638. Again, in a work entitled *The Foot out of the Snare*, by John Gee, an apostate, mention is made of several Catholic books which appear to contain information about Campion. One reference is to F. Richard Conway's *Apology*, p. 281, where there is an account how "one Mr. Anderton, a Lancashire gent, was cured of the stone by some relics of F. Campion; and being afterwards of another disease laid out for dead (*ut ei jam pollices ligarentur*), by the help of the martyr's flesh laid on his body he was raised to life." The writer has looked in vain for any information concerning this book of F. Conway, whom he supposes to be the F. Conyers who was confessor to the English College of Douai in 1600. Again, for Campion's girdle Gee refers to Edmund's *Book of Miracles*, another work of which he can learn nothing. If any reader can give any information about these books, he will confer a great favour upon the writer.